

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

VOLUME 30, NUMBER 3

JULY 1948

# MID-AMERICA

## *An Historical Review*

JULY 1948

VOLUME 30

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 19

NUMBER 3

---

### CONTENTS

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN THE WORLD WAR I ERA . . . . .	<i>Aaron Abell</i> 139
CADILLAC AT DETROIT . . . . .	<i>Jean Delanglez</i> 152
FRANCISCO PABLO VASQUEZ AND THE INDE- PENDENCE OF MEXICO . . . . .	<i>W. Eugene Shiels</i> 177
THE FIRST ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FAITH IN NEW FRANCE—CHAPTERS XXI TO XXV . .	<i>Jean Delanglez</i> 187
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .	215

---

#### MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

#### EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL  
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA  
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON  
PAUL KINIERY  
JEAN DELANGLEZ

---

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

# MID-AMERICA

## *An Historical Review*

JULY 1948

VOLUME 30

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 19

NUMBER 3

### The Catholic Church and Social Problems in the World War I Era

The second decade of the present century is the most significant ten-year span in the history of Catholic social action in the United States. In that period the Catholic Church redefined, expanded, and coordinated its urban social policy. By enlarging the scope of its social mission, the Church in these years was able to cope more effectively with the religious problems of a now dominant urban society and to influence appreciably the direction of social policy during the economic crisis of the late twenties and the thirties.

Long before 1910, it is worth noting, Catholics in large numbers had worked in various ways to bring about reforms in the prevailing economic and social order. The general character of the Catholic population fostered interest in movements for social betterment. By the turn of the century, urban immigrants and their children made up fully five-sixths of the Church's swelling membership. As wage earners for the most part, they suffered poverty and general insecurity—the twin hazards of the urban masses in a predominantly *laissez-faire* epoch. In the hope of remedying matters, the Catholic rank and file had turned to trade-unionism, making up a good half of the membership of the Knights of Labor and of the American Federation of Labor. In lesser numbers Catholics affiliated with the more radical movements of the late nineteenth century, notably with Henry George's crusade against land monopoly. In support of the so-called Single Tax program, the Reverend Edward McGlynn mobilized an impressive number of Irish-American Catholics.

Conservative Catholics fearing a subversion of the social order

---

Note. This paper was read at the meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, April 24, 1948, at Rock Island, Illinois. Editor.

viewed these movements with profound suspicion and urged the Church to condemn them. But the Hierarchy refused to do so. Thus, as is well known, Cardinal Gibbons with the support of his fellow-bishops persuaded Rome in 1886 to lift its recently imposed ban on the Knights of Labor. Following a prolonged controversy, the Church also permitted Father McGlynn to agitate for his land reform theories. But this action did not mean, it must be emphasized, that the Church was yet ready to make the promotion of social reform an integral part of its religious mission. The Hierarchy's attitude toward social reform was more negative than positive, more tolerating than approving. Only in part, it must be confessed, was the Hierarchy motivated by considerations of justice and charity, the usual grounds of Catholic action. The Church authorities refused to condemn Catholics participating in social reform out of considerations essentially political. The bishops were thoroughly convinced that the Church's peace and progress depended on the speedy Americanization of its members and leadership. As Gibbons stated in his letter defending the Knights of Labor, "The accusation of being un-American—that is to say, alien to our national spirit—is the most powerful weapon which the enemies of the Church can employ against her." Catholics must cultivate, he insisted, a patriotic citizenship in keeping with the country's civil institutions and customs. And this meant that Catholics were ordinarily free, apart from ecclesiastical authority, to make decisions on social, political, and economic questions.

Only in this permissive sense—as an aspect of Americanization—did the Catholic Church display any marked interest in social reform before the second decade of the twentieth century. American Catholics had not organized to carry forward the Church's positive social program as outlined in recent papal encyclicals, especially in *Rerum Novarum*, Leo XIII's great pronouncement on the condition of labor, issued in May, 1891. Though Leo denounced Socialism and defended private property as an ordinance of the natural law, he insisted that the property right be exercised in accordance with the age-old precepts of justice and charity. Employers were morally bound, he emphasized, to pay workers a living wage, the wage to be high enough to support the wage-earner "in reasonable and frugal comfort." In order to win this objective, employees had a natural right to associate in trade unions. Moreover, the state should intervene not only to regulate the terms of the wage contract but also to remove or lessen the many burdens inflicted upon workers by modern industrial society. Thus Leo would have the



public administration eliminate Sunday labor, shorten the work day, prohibit or regulate the labor of women and children in factories and work-shops, and use the taxing power to encourage an increase in the number of property holders.

For nearly two decades American Catholics virtually ignored these social teachings of Leo XIII. A conspicuous exception was the Midwestern Populist, the Reverend John A. Ryan, a professor in the St. Paul Seminary, whose book, *A Living Wage*, published in 1906, was the first to explore scientifically the bearing of Leo's encyclical on industrial reform in the United States. He complained, however, that he lacked backing. "The bishops who have made any pronouncements in this matter," he wrote in 1909, "could probably be counted on the fingers of one hand, while the priests who have done so are not more numerous proportionally."<sup>1</sup> The clergy had equally ignored social works, for example, building associations, cooperative societies, settlement houses, consumer leagues, and child labor committees, that is, agencies designed to lessen or remove urban evils by removing their causes.

The Church, of course, had practiced charity to a conspicuous degree, having by 1910 nearly twelve hundred charitable institutions. These establishments, mainly orphan asylums, hospitals, and homes for the aged, were for the most part relief agencies which aimed only to protect individuals against the effects of urban evils, not to remove the evils themselves. Of preventive philanthropy the Church as yet had very little. Catholics as a group were not yet active in the social settlement and related movements. Though St. Rose's Settlement in New York and Brownson House in Los Angeles, for example, were among the finest in the land, the settlement idea was not understood by Catholics generally. Thus a Catholic magazine complained in 1904 that in the Catholic view the social settlement was no more than "another agency in the Church through which pious and unsophisticated young Catholics can work off their youthful zest and energy, and get some experience in practical charity."<sup>2</sup> This flippant attitude ignored the role of the settlement in studying and publicizing social conditions, in stimulating the forces of neighborhood regeneration, and in promoting municipal reform and labor legislation.

Catholics presently realized, however, that they must come to

<sup>1</sup> "The Church and the Workingman," *Catholic World*, LXXXIX (Sept., 1909), 781.

<sup>2</sup> "Educated Catholics and the 'Social Settlement' Question", *The Dolphin*, VI (Dec., 1904), 703-704.

terms with the social movement. As the trade unions steadily and rapidly gained in membership, as scholars and humanitarians pushed forward a comprehensive program of labor legislation, as the leaders of organized charity grimly determined to discover and remove the causes of urban poverty, and as the new social politics of Progressivism won the electorate, the Church's hold on the loyalty of her members was jeopardized. Catholics in large numbers lost interest in the Church which seemed indifferent, if not hostile, to all movements for the promotion of their economic welfare. Many Catholics, in fact, turned to Socialism, acquiescing in Socialist propaganda in the trade unions, joining the Socialist party and supporting its candidates for public office. This drift was so strong by 1909 that a Socialist magazine predicted that within five years "the Socialist movement within the Catholic Church . . . will be one of the great forces of the Socialist party."<sup>3</sup> Studiously refraining from attacking the Catholic religion, Socialists promised Catholics material welfare, "more of the product of their hands, shorter hours and better conditions, *here and now*."<sup>4</sup>

This incipient alliance between Catholic workingmen and the Socialist movement was vigorously assailed by the Church's authorized spokesmen who contended that Socialism embraced not only an economic program but also a materialistic philosophy opposed to Christianity and all forms of revealed religion. For a time, however, Catholic apologists failed to differentiate between the economic and philosophic aspects of the Socialist movement, denouncing each with almost equal vigor. This wholly negative attitude toward Socialism meant in practice Catholic support of the intolerable abuses of the prevailing system. Thus Catholic newspapers "not infrequently" upheld the "robber trusts," Socialists gleefully pointed out, and suppressed "the really salient passages" in Leo's encyclical for "fear of offending their capitalistic readers and advertisers!"<sup>5</sup>

Realizing that such conduct only intensified the malady that must be cured, thoughtful Catholics under Ryan's leadership demanded a moratorium on denunciations of economic Socialism. The economics of Socialism—Essential Economic Socialism or Semi-Socialism, as Ryan called it—did not fall "under the condemnation

<sup>3</sup> *Wilshire's Magazine* quoted in *Catholic Fortnightly Review*, XVI (July 1, 1909), 402.

<sup>4</sup> Fred D. Warren, *The Catholic Church and Socialism*, Gerard, Kansas, 1914, 7.

<sup>5</sup> "Fighting Socialism with Boomerangs," *Catholic Fortnightly Review*, XVI (Nov. 15, 1909), 647-648.

of either the moral law or the Church."<sup>6</sup> For the Socialism of Debs, Spargo, and Hillquit permitted as much private property as Leo's encyclical really demanded. At no time during a long life did Ryan believe, and much less his growing army of followers believe, that a Socialist economy was desirable or practicable. But they affirmed that such a regime would not be necessarily immoral. They were certain that less criticism of economic Socialism would tend to keep Catholics out of the socialist movement and to convince them that "the Church is not opposed to genuine and legitimate industrial reform."<sup>7</sup>

This strategy against Socialism was first widely followed by the men and women who directed the Church's manifold charities. Alarmed at the growth of social discontent which stemmed, they believed, from bad industrial conditions, they organized in 1910 the National Conference of Catholic Charities. Led mainly by Monsignor William J. White of Brooklyn and the Reverend William J. Kerby, professor of sociology in the Catholic University at Washington, these charity workers were "nearly as progressive as Leo XIII or Pius X" on the issue of the Church's social mission.<sup>8</sup> At its first meeting the Conference laid down its platform, namely, the coordination of Catholic charities, cooperation with non-Catholic charity organizations and "a war on the causes of poverty whether that cause is a disease germ lurking in a dark corner or a merchant prince grown rich on defrauding laborers of their wages."<sup>9</sup> As organ of the social conscience and attorney for the poor, the Conference in the decade that followed championed protective labor legislation, persuaded Catholics to expand and improve the old and to adopt the new forms of charity, and encouraged the growth of a trained personnel for Catholic social service.

The formation of the National Conference of Catholic Charities owed most, perhaps, to the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the poor-relief organization, which for several years had cautiously applied the new ideas. All the Catholic societies now adopted a social program, either singly or through their affiliating body, the American Federation of Catholic Societies, which by 1912 represented three million members. The initiative was taken by the German Catholic

<sup>6</sup> "May a Catholic be a Socialist?," *Catholic Fortnightly Review*, XVI (Feb. 1, 1909), 72.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, (July 1, 1909), 394.

<sup>8</sup> William J. Kerby, "The National Conference of Catholic Charities. An Interpretation," *Catholic World*, XCII (Nov., 1910), 148-149.

<sup>9</sup> Monsignor William J. White, "The First National Conference of Catholic Charities," *Survey*, XXV (Oct. 8, 1910), 93-94.

Central Verein, whose hundred and twenty-five thousand members established in 1908 a Central Bureau for the Promotion of Social Education, and a German-English magazine, *Central Blatt and Social Justice*, exclusively devoted to social improvement. At its convention of 1909, the society formulated in specific terms a notably constructive program, calling especially "for the promotion of more progressive labor legislation." To the end of helping to secure such legislation, the Verein's main interest, it launched a social study-program and championed the cause of union labor. While conceding "that organized labor in the trade union movement has at times made mistakes," the Union "unhesitatingly" endorsed "the right of organization" and recommended "faithful co-operation with the American Federation of Labor, guided as it is by conservatism, with the National Civic Federation, with the American Association for Labor Legislation and kindred organizations." The Verein fought the powerful open-shop campaign as "tantamount to a denial of the workingman's right to organize."<sup>10</sup>

Presently the Verein's program was taken up by the American Federation of Catholic Societies. In statements and resolutions approved in successive conventions after 1910, the Federation declared its sympathy with the aspirations of the workers to better their condition by organized effort in conservative trade unions, endorsed collective bargaining and trade agreements and urged employers to recognize the fundamental right of workingmen to organize. The Federation pledged its support to all legislation for the elimination of unnecessary labor on Sunday, a living wage, reasonable hours of labor, protection of life and limb, abolition of child labor, just compensation for injury, and proper moral and sanitary conditions in the home, shop, mine and factory.<sup>11</sup> In the hope of making the program a reality, the Federation set up in 1911 a Social Service Commission to function as a continuing body. Its chairman was Bishop Peter J. Muldoon of Rockford, a truly progressive prelate who for many years was the Hierarchy's official spokesman on social questions.<sup>12</sup>

The man who did most, however, to formulate and extend the

<sup>10</sup> "The Aftermath of the Indianapolis Convention," *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, II (Oct., 1909), 7-9; "A Catholic Social Movement Under Way," *Catholic Fortnightly Review*, XVI (Nov., 1909), 642.

<sup>11</sup> "Views of Catholic Societies," *Survey*, XXIX, (Oct. 19, 1912), 84; "Resolutions of the Catholic Federation," *America*, IX (Aug. 23, 1913), 479; John J. Burke, "The Catholic Federation Convention," *Outlook*, CXIII (Aug. 30, 1916), 1030-1032.

<sup>12</sup> "Catholic Federation Resolutions," *Catholic News*, Sept. 2, 1911, 5.

Federation's social program was the Social Service Commission's secretary, the Reverend Peter E. Dietz. Born in New York City in 1878, Dietz was ordained priest in 1904 and spent the next two decades organizing Catholics for social action. Brilliant and versatile, he labored with painstaking and untiring zeal. He discerned the new needs and induced his fellow-Catholics to meet them. The influence he exerted was second only to Ryan's. Both men were superb moulders of public opinion, Ryan primarily as the academician and Dietz primarily as the organizer of the American Catholic social movement.

Dietz first attracted national attention through the pages of the *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, whose English section he launched and for a short time edited. Sensing the need of better understanding between the Church and the labor movement, Dietz attended the American Federation of Labor convention in 1909 on his own initiative and in succeeding years as fraternal delegate of the American Federation of Catholic Societies. He was particularly impressed with the recently founded church-labor committees and social service commissions of the leading Protestant denominations and of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America.<sup>13</sup> With the aid of Catholic trade-union officials he accordingly organized a small society in 1910, The Militia of Christ for Social Service. Dietz served as its executive secretary and as editor of its short-lived magazine, *Social Service*, while Peter W. Collins, the secretary-treasurer of the Electrical Workers of America, became the society's official lecturer.<sup>14</sup> The Militia of Christ directed its fire against extremists, on the one hand against Socialists in their attempts to capture the American Federation of Labor and on the other against conservative Catholics in the habit of grossly exaggerating radical influences in the Gompers' body.<sup>15</sup>

In forming the Militia of Christ, Father Dietz and his associates hoped to encourage the federated Catholic societies to broaden their social program. When with the creation of the Social Service Com-

<sup>13</sup> For an excellent account of these organizations see Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in America Protestantism 1865-1915*, Yale Studies in Religious Education, XIV, New Haven, 1940, 280-317.

<sup>14</sup> Peter E. Dietz, *The Militia of Christ. Constitution and Charter Laws*, Milwaukee, 1912.

<sup>15</sup> Peter E. Dietz, "Trade Unions and Catholics," American Federation of Catholic Societies, *Bulletin*, VII (March, 1913), 6-7; Peter W. Collins, "The Labor Movement and Socialism," *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, II (Feb., 1910), 7-10, in reply to Joseph Husslein, S.J., "Socialism and the American Federation of Labor," *America*, II (Nov. 13, 1909), 113-114.



mission this expectation was realized, the Militia of Christ while keeping its identity joined forces with the stronger and more representative body. As the Commission's secretary Dietz spread its social teachings far and wide. He supervised the preparation and distribution of an extensive pamphlet literature; he supplied the Catholic press with a weekly newsletter applying Catholic social doctrines to current issues. Made editor of the widely read *Bulletin*, official organ of the Catholic societies, he devoted more than half its space to a Social Service section.<sup>16</sup>

In their yearly conventions the Federation and its Commission analyzed every significant aspect of the social question, not merely labor-management relations. Besides social legislation, the Social Service Commission explored the whole problem of social work in its bearing on the successful handling of immigrants. The discussions made clear that modern "scientific social work, and especially work of a preventative kind, . . . is the imperative need of our immigrant parishes."<sup>17</sup>

The Charities Conference, the Militia of Christ, and the Social Service Commission marked "a new advance in Social service in the American Catholic Church," wrote the *Survey* magazine in 1912.<sup>18</sup> In themselves instruments of social study with a view to social action, they encouraged miscellaneous forms of social education during the decade: study clubs, institutes, summer schools and lecture bureaus. Besides wafting social doctrine through all the working forces of the Church, these agencies of social study prompted the founding of several schools of philanthropy and social service in which many men and women were thoroughly trained in the theory and practice of social action.<sup>19</sup> The first of these schools opened in Boston in 1913; by the end of the decade a half-dozen or more flourished in various parts of the country. The Boston school functioned alongside the Catholic charities of the city, while most of the others were university enterprises, notably the excellent ones at Loyola University, Chicago, and Fordham University, New York. The Loyola school was founded by

<sup>16</sup> "Our Catholic Social Work in 1913," *America*, X (Jan. 3, 1914), 301; "The Social Service Commission," *Bulletin*, VIII (Feb., 1914), 5; Paul L. Blakely, "The Federated Catholic Societies," *America*, XI (Oct. 10, 1914), 638-639.

<sup>17</sup> Frederick Siedenburgh, S.J., "The Immigration Problem," *Bulletin*, X (Oct., 1915), 1, 4.

<sup>18</sup> "Views of Catholic Societies," XXIX (Oct. 19, 1912), 84.

<sup>19</sup> *Bulletin*, VIII (May, 1914), 6; *America*, VIII (Oct. 12, 1912), 16; *ibid.*, X (Oct. 18, 1913), 40; *ibid.*, (Dec. 27, 1913), 280.



the Reverend Frederic Siedenburg whose brilliant career in the social movement followed several years of study in Europe.<sup>20</sup>

Perhaps the best results in the field of social training were scored by Father Dietz whose school, the American Academy of Christian Democracy for Women, as he called it, was widely acclaimed. Sharing in the growing conviction that successful social work required a trained personnel, he opened his institution in 1915 at Hot Springs, North Carolina, relocating in Cincinnati once the experiment demonstrated its usefulness. In the eight years of its existence, the school provided its hundreds of graduates with a most satisfactory social education which enabled them to assume positions of leadership in almost every major Catholic community.<sup>21</sup>

The graduates of the social service schools facilitated the vast expansion in Catholic social work which occurred during the decade. Charity agencies doubled in number, institutions of the new philanthropy making up nearly all the increase. The number of social settlements increased from about twenty to a hundred or more, while other forms of the new charity, for example, child-caring devices and boarding homes for working women, also multiplied many fold. The various industrial schools, day nurseries and kindergartens, already established, broadened the scope of their work. Lay women, through hundreds of clubs, leagues or guilds, some of which were national in scope, were mainly responsible for these efforts at social betterment. By the end of the decade Catholics had come to regard social service as a religious calling. So great was the interest that in the early twenties some immigrant groups and their friends organized to promote institutional methods of church work; these methods were esteemed the American way of securing religious results.<sup>22</sup>

As the new charities multiplied, means of coordination on the local level became increasingly imperative. Beginning in Pittsburgh in 1910, bureaus of Catholic charities were organized in over thirty heavily Catholic communities. On the genesis of these bodies the

<sup>20</sup> *St. Vincent de Paul Quarterly*, XIX (Aug., 1914), 185-192; *ibid.*, XXI (Nov., 1916), 322-327; *Catholic Charities Review*, I (Feb., 1917), 60, 62; *ibid.*, III (Sept., 1919), 215-216; *ibid.*, V (April, 1921), 128; *ibid.*, (Oct., 1921), 274.

<sup>21</sup> *Bulletin*, X (Aug., 1915), 1; *ibid.*, (Oct., 1915), 2; *ibid.*, (Nov., 1915), 1; *ibid.*, XII (April, 1917), 4; *ibid.*, (Sept.-Oct., 1917), 13-14; *The White Cross Nurse*, Series VI (July, 1917), 1-12; *Announcements of the American Academy of Christian Democracy for Women*, Asheville, N. C., 1916.

<sup>22</sup> "The Cyrenians. A New Association for Immigrant Welfare Work," *Catholic Charities Review*, VI (Oct., 1922), 277-280; "The Cyrenians," *ibid.*, (Dec., 1922), 364-366; *ibid.*, VII (Feb., 1923), 60-61.

National Conference of Catholic Charities and the federated Catholic societies exerted a decisive influence.<sup>23</sup> While their primary task was to supervise and correlate Catholic charities, a good half of the bureaus employed full-time social workers for family case work. Only a few bureaus were strong enough to cover the whole field of Catholic relief. The prevailing practice restricted the bureaus to Catholic cases involving religious or moral problems, the more normal cases being left to secular agencies.<sup>24</sup>

Catholic social service steadily advanced in spite of the resistance it met from many priests and a large part of the Catholic press. Objection centered on the professional social worker who in some quarters was considered "as a sort of cold-blooded mercenary."<sup>25</sup> Many Catholics were slow to realize that specialists had become necessary, that for the performance of the new tasks the Church could not rely entirely upon lay volunteers or members of religious orders. This was a most serious difficulty—the psychological inability of many to understand how a person could legitimately earn a money income helping others. The extent and character of the opposition alarmed and distressed social workers; one of their number, Margaret Tucker, widely known settlement leader and teacher in Dietz's school, suggested a compromise system, namely, the semi-cloistered deaconess institution. This arrangement, she felt, would allay suspicion that the social worker was motivated by worldly considerations without impairing her lay freedom and usefulness.<sup>26</sup>

Her plan was not widely adopted, partly because the nation's entry into World War I called for social action which only lay folk could perform. To this end, the Hierarchy itself, in August, 1917, assumed general oversight of Catholic war-time social service by creating the National Catholic War Council, whose Administrative Committee was headed by the experienced Bishop Muldoon. The Council was the Catholic counterpart of the War-Time Commission of the Federal Council of Churches and the Jewish

<sup>23</sup> M. J. Seanlan, "Diocesan Charities and Their Organization," *Catholic Charities Review*, II (Dec., 1918), 297-301; Frederick Siedenburgh, "Federation of Catholic Societies," *Catholic World*, CXI (July, 1920), 438-439; John O'Grady, "New Perspectives in Charity," *Commonweal*, X (Oct. 30, 1929), 668-670.

<sup>24</sup> John O'Grady, "The Future of Catholic Case Work," *Catholic Charities Review*, VI (March, 1922), 93-95.

<sup>25</sup> Margaret Tucker, "Catholic Settlement Work—An Analyses," *Catholic Charities Review*, II (Dec., 1918), 306.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, III (Jan. 1919), 18-21; Margaret Tucker, "Cross Currents in Catholic Charities," *ibid.*, VI (March, 1922), 78; "Two Letters on Social Service," *ibid.*, III (Sept., 1919), 204-205; "A Religious Community of Professional Social Workers," *ibid.*, V (April, 1921), 124-127.

Welfare Board, and with them derived its main financial support from the various war drive funds. With ample means at its disposal the National Catholic War Council through its Committee on Special War Activities expanded and coordinated existing social agencies and created new ones for the purpose of securing the spiritual welfare of the service man and his family and of maintaining patriotic morale in the major cities. Besides establishing two playgrounds and twenty-one welfare houses in Allied countries, the Council built and operated twelve visitors' houses in connection with army camps, founded twenty-two clubs and subsidized hundreds of others for the use of service men, opened fifteen Catholic hospitals to the free after-care of discharged veterans and their families and set up two rehabilitation schools, thirty-nine employment bureaus and fifteen workingmen's clubs. By early 1920 when its activities ended the Council had also established twenty-eight settlement or community centers to the end that the discontent stirred up by the war and its aftermath might be turned from "radicalism and anarchy" "into the ways of American liberty and freedom."<sup>27</sup>

The Council was deeply concerned, in fact, with Americanization, launching a country-wide Civic Education Program aimed primarily at the millions of immigrants "who have had," it was regretfully said, "no instruction in democracy or any experience in its operations."<sup>28</sup> The oversight of the campaign was entrusted to Dr. John A. Lapp, noted expert in the fields of vocational education and labor legislation. For the use of students and lecturers he prepared two text-books, *The Fundamentals of Citizenship*, and *Co-Builders of our America*, which in the judgment of many non-Catholic educators were the best of their kind.<sup>29</sup> While Lapp and his associates in the Council urged all immigrants to seek speedy naturalization, they avoided the usual attempts at forcing the English language and American ways upon the foreign-born. Nor did they teach that true patriotism meant blind devotion to the nation apart from the great ideals of truth, justice, and human brotherhood. "We hold," they emphasized, "that no plan short of complete social justice should be held as a goal in programs for good citizenship or Americanization."<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> "The Promise Fulfilled," *National Catholic War Council Bulletin*, I (Feb., 1920), 13-18.

<sup>28</sup> John A. Lapp, "The Campaign for Civic Instruction," *The National Catholic War Council Bulletin*, I (July, 1919), 11-12.

<sup>29</sup> "The Fundamentals of Citizenship," *ibid.*, (Nov., 1919), 22-24.

<sup>30</sup> John A. Lapp, "Bogus Propaganda: Dollar Mark Shows in Attempts to Control Americanization Program," *ibid.*, (June-July, 1920), 9-10.

The Council acted on this conviction when in February, 1919, it issued the Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction. Although in two places the undesirability of Socialism was alluded to, the document exposed the flaws in the existing system and advanced a dozen remedies, some of which seemed far-reaching at the time. Thus the Program called for social insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity, and old age; a federal child labor law; the legal enforcement of labor's right to organize; public housing for the working classes; progressive taxation of inheritances, incomes and excess profits; stringent regulation of public utility rates; government competition with monopolies if necessary to secure effective control; worker participation in management; and co-operative productive societies and co-partnership arrangements in order to enable the majority of wage earners to "become owners, or at least in part, of the instruments of production."<sup>31</sup> These were indeed far-reaching proposals—for the reform, of course, not the overthrow, of the existing order. Compared to the "voluntarism" of Samuel Gompers and the ruling groups in the American Federation of Labor, the Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction was truly radical. It epitomized in fact the aspirations of the democratic, non-Communist left-wing of the post-war American labor movement. On one issue, namely, the legal enforcement of labor's right to organize, the Bishops' Program displayed uniqueness and prophecy. The Catholic bishops were the first important group to suggest legislation for the positive encouragement of trade unionism and collective bargaining. Neither wing of the labor movement recognized the possibilities of the proposal until the economic crisis of the late twenties and the thirties. Then it speedily became an article in labor's faith and finally as a result of court decisions and the New Deal labor laws, avowed public policy.

Besides promoting more or less directly the triple program of industrial reform, civic education and social service, the National Catholic War Council sought to co-ordinate all the working forces of the Church to these and other ends. Its peace-time successor, the National Catholic Welfare Council, formed late in 1919, continued the task, working through five bureaus one of which was the Department of Social Action, headed by Muldoon and directed by Ryan and Lapp. To some students of social trends, the emergence of the Welfare Council (Conference after 1922) was another victory for Catholic centralization. Though a few Catholics

---

<sup>31</sup> John A. Regan, *Social Reconstruction*, New York, 1920, 235.

echoed this interpretation, the men and women associated with the Conference insisted that the creation of the new body meant not the centralization but "the coordination of Catholic effort."<sup>32</sup> The new organization aimed not to dictate but to aid and facilitate the working plans of all Catholic social agencies.

In any view, the formation of the National Catholic Welfare Conference culminated a fruitful decade of thought and action in the social field. In these years the Catholic Church officially formulated and to a marked degree perfected an integrated urban social policy. Heavily urban in membership since the 1840's and 1850's, the Church had wrestled continually with its difficult environment, and with no little success. For a full half century, however, it had acquiesced in rather than positively promoted social reform, subordinating this part of its religious mission to the pressing demands of charity and Americanization. As the progress of Socialism and the new philanthropy began to alienate many Catholics early in the present century, social reform gained central place among the Church's welfare activities. Convinced now that the Church and its immigrant members stood in less need of Americanization than did industry and trade, the Church authorities boldly demanded social reform in the name of justice and charity, the only truly legitimate grounds of Catholic action. Ryan, Dietz, Kerby, Muldoon and Lapp were the inspiring personalities; the Charities Conference, the Social Service Commission and the War Council were the instrumentalities through which they worked.

AARON ABELL

University of Notre Dame

---

<sup>32</sup> "The National Catholic Welfare Council," *The National Catholic War Council Bulletin*, I (Jan., 1920), 7-8.



## Cadillac at Detroit

After the fort at Detroit was completed, Cadillac started building a warehouse to shelter the merchandise, and also began to write. His first letter, addressed to Pontchartrain under date of August 31, 1701, is unfortunately not extant except in the form of an abstract in the third person for the minister.<sup>1</sup> The fort, he declares, is capable of stopping the English and the Iroquois, but more men are needed: he must have 200 picked soldiers who should at the same time know some trade, and he insists that he is able to feed that number. The abstract continues:

He is very much pleased with the help given him by Sieurs Tonti and Charconacle. He feels obliged to say, however, that Father Vaillant, a Jesuit, who went to Detroit with the convoy did all he could to prevent the success of the post which Cadillac founded. Vaillant went so far as to say that those who remained would become slaves, or at least would lead a miserable life; that his post was nothing but a chimera and would only last one year. All this talk made such an impression that part of the men asked to return to Montreal with this Father, who, after having cost the king more than 100 pistoles to send him to Detroit, told Cadillac that he had made arrangements with his superior to go back to Quebec in the autumn, and that the Recollect who is acting as chaplain for the troops was enough to take care of the men at the post.

He [Cadillac] even maintains that this Jesuit made known to the chief of the Indians that this Recollect only came into this part of the country to bring death to them; so that several of the chiefs asked him [Cadillac] whether this was true, and it was very difficult for him to dispell their fear.

He represents that if His Majesty does not grant the Seminary of Quebec some gratuity to support a few missionaries at Detroit, to educate the children of the Indians, and to teach them French, and if the same bounty is not granted the Recollects for the same purpose, he does not think that he can found an establishment on this place; being convinced that the Jesuits will omit nothing to wreck it, because they do not want to stay there, and because they take umbrage at the Recollects and the Priests of the Foreign Missions.

Up to this time the French have not been buying large hides from the Indians, because it was too cumbersome to transport them; he promises to change all that. He also needs more boats to transport the product of his farm—to be begun next year—to Montreal; and finally, he begs the minister to set up an independent government in the region between Detroit and Niagara, and, naturally, appoint Cadillac as governor.

<sup>1</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, August 31, 1701, AC, C 11A, 19: 92-94v.



We are not concerned with Cadillac's rosy dreams, which lend such glowing colors to his description of the Detroit River and of the surrounding country. "Sieur de Lamothe," wrote Callières and Champigny to Pontchartrain with their tongues in their cheeks, "sent us a favorable description of the country where he is; although he says that he is sending a copy of it to you, we are attaching a copy to our letter."<sup>2</sup> The description is so poetic that the minister answered saying: "I beg of you to send me at the first opportunity a plan of your establishment and an exact, and fully detailed account of the country and of its surroundings. As I will read it to His Majesty, you must not write the sort of things you sent me last time. You made it read so much like a novel that no one could take seriously a single bit of its contents."<sup>3</sup> We are, however, greatly interested in some of the statements which he attributed to Father Vaillant, in this first letter, especially in the light of what is known about Vaillant from other sources.

Father François Vaillant de Gueslis came to Canada in 1670 when he was twenty-four years old;<sup>4</sup> he taught the lower classes at the college of Quebec until his ordination on December 1, 1675.<sup>5</sup> For the next two years, he was assistant to Father Chaumonot at Lorette, and was then sent to the Iroquois missions in 1678. There he had spiritual charge of the Mohawks until his return to Quebec in 1685, to continue his ministerial work among the Indians of the neighborhood.<sup>6</sup> From 1686 to 1692, his official duties were those of treasurer of the college of Quebec. During this period he accompanied the Denonville expedition,<sup>7</sup> and also went to Albany to negotiate with Governor Dongan.<sup>8</sup> The governor of New York sent him back to Fort Frontenac, escorted by two Indians to prevent him from having anything to do with the Mohawks.<sup>9</sup> At the time of the abandoning of Fort Frontenac, he returned to Quebec and resumed his duties of treasurer.

<sup>2</sup> Callières and Champigny to Pontchartrain, October 5, 1701, AC, C 11A, 19: 16v; printed in Margry, 5: 190, translated in MPHS, 33: 110.

<sup>3</sup> Pontchartrain to Cadillac, May 6, 1702, AC, B 22: 78v.

<sup>4</sup> C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 3 vols., Paris, 1895-1896, 2: 413, note 2.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. Gosselin, *Vie de Mgr de Laval*, 2 vols., Québec, 1890, 2: 691.

<sup>6</sup> Copies of the catalogues for these years in the Archives of the Collège Ste. Marie. The catalogue for 1685 has the following note: "P. J. Garnier, Millet, Vaillant, reduces ab Iroq. propter imminens bellum. Occupantur in variis mission[ibus]."

<sup>7</sup> E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (NYCD), Albany, 1855, 9: 334.

<sup>8</sup> NYCD, 9: 389; 3: 510, 519, 520-531. Charlevoix, Shea's edition, 3: 300.

<sup>9</sup> Charlevoix, Shea's edition, 3: 302.

In 1692, he was appointed superior of the Jesuit residence in Montreal;<sup>10</sup> after four years there he returned once more to Quebec, and took up the duties of treasurer of the college.<sup>11</sup> He was occupying this position when he was sent with Cadillac to Detroit in 1701. The governor of Canada had ordered him to return via Fort Frontenac,<sup>12</sup> intending that he should go back to his former mission. He left for the Seneca village with Father Garnier,<sup>13</sup> in August 1702.<sup>14</sup> Two years later, the Seneca Indians sent him as their representative, asking Governor Vaudreuil to demand satisfaction from the Ottawa for a violation of the treaty of 1701. He then returned to western New York and contributed not a little to thwart the effort of Colonel Schuyler who sought to prevail upon the Five Nations at Onondaga to expel the Jesuit missionaries.<sup>15</sup> Father Vaillant remained in the Seneca mission until 1707, when he was succeeded by Father d'Heu; he took up his residence at Montreal, where he remained in office until 1715.<sup>16</sup> Two years later, after having spent forty-seven years in Canada, he returned to France and died at Moulins, on September 24, 1718.<sup>17</sup>

As time went by, the commandant embellished his above-mentioned version of what had taken place at Detroit. It must be said that by 1704, Cadillac was certain that no Jesuit would ever go to his post; hence he did not care what he said. The account of Vaillant's conduct in Detroit is found in a memorandum of November 14, 1704, couched in the form of questions and answers.<sup>18</sup> Pontchartrain is supposed to be asking the questions, and Cadillac, of course, knows all the answers.

<sup>10</sup> *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques* (BRH), 34 (1928): 305.

<sup>11</sup> AC, C 11E, 14: 138; Rochemonteix, 3: 376, note 1.

<sup>12</sup> Marest to Cadillac, October 8, 1701, Margry, 5: 215.

<sup>13</sup> Callières to Pontchartrain, November 4, 1702, NYCD, 9: 737; Silvy to Thyrsus González, October 29, 1702, Jesuit Archives, Rome, *Gallia*, 110, II, 259; Raffeix and Germain to *id.*, *ibid.*, *Gallia* 110, I, 89, 90.

<sup>14</sup> AC, C 11E, 14: 138; Crépieu to Thyrsus González, October 28, 1702, Jesuit Archives, Rome, *Gallia*, 110, II, 258.

<sup>15</sup> NYCD, 9: 759, 761-764; Charlevoix, Shea's edition, 5: 164.

<sup>16</sup> BRH, 34 (1928): 505.

<sup>17</sup> [A. Melançon], *Liste des Missionnaires Jésuites, Nouvelle-France et Louisiane, 1611-1800*, Montreal, 1929, s. v.

<sup>18</sup> The document is in AC, C 11E, 14: 168-198; printed in English in MPHS, 33: 198 ff. The ridiculous theory that this dialogue took place in Quebec (E. M. Sheldon, *The Early History of Michigan from the first settlement to 1815*, New York and Chicago, 1856, 142 ff, and J. V. Campbell, *Outlines of Political History of Michigan*, Detroit, 1876, 67 ff), has been disposed of. The very idea of Pontchartrain coming to Quebec is preposterous. But it cannot be believed, says Burton (MPHS, 33: 241, note), "that because Cadillac used this form of reporting his troubles, he is unworthy of confidence." Whether Cadillac reports his troubles in prose or in poetry, in dialogue or in monologue, makes no difference, he simply cannot be trusted.

The Jesuits, having had information by the first vessel [from France] that you [Pontchartrain] had resolved to have Detroit settled, came down to the river side and showed me much courtesy, which I returned as best I could. When they learned that the settlement would be started, they busied themselves effectively with the governor general and the intendant in their usual manner, in order to establish themselves there to the exclusion of all other ecclesiastics. This was immediately granted them and they nominated Father Vaillant to go and take possession.

In May 1701, he goes on to say, when he arrived in Montreal ready to leave for Detroit, a change was made; a Franciscan was to go with the convoy to act as chaplain of the troops. The Jesuits were persuaded that Cadillac had made the change. At Detroit, Father Vaillant exerted himself so well "that if the soldiers and Canadians had believed him, they would have set out after two days for Montreal on the promise made by this Father that he would get their wages paid by the intendant for a whole year, although they had been employed only six weeks." Cadillac then explains how he found out that Father Vaillant was the cause of the trouble. He assembled his men for a general meeting at which the Jesuit was also to be present. When the latter saw that the soldiers were about to speak of the discontent he was spreading, he promptly retreated and ran to the woods. But why, asked Pontchartrain, not reprimand him? Because, said Cadillac, this would have been bad for the service of the king; that is why he contented himself "with informing the governor general and with giving you an account of it." Since then the "Jesuits [are] so offended that I can easily understand why they have sworn to ruin me in one way or another."

The scene at the Quebec dock may be dismissed as imaginary. Cadillac came back on the *Seine*, bringing the order that the Detroit proposal be examined anew. The Jesuits could hardly have come down to honor the "executor" of the plan, for when he landed neither the governor nor the intendant had as yet approved of it; and then, Champigny took Charron's plan instead. As regards their being anxious to send a man to Detroit, their private letters sent in that year to the General of the Order are unanimous in saying that it is impossible to man the missions already opened.

The letter of Father de Crépieu, for instance, says that "This Canadian mission stands in the greatest need of laborers, for none had been sent from France for the past two years." Fathers Nouvel, Binneteau, and Favre, have gone to their reward; Fathers Enjalran and Baury have returned to France. Delegates from four Iroquois villages have come to Montreal to ask for Jesuit mission-

aries; "four of them have already left with these Indians... Moreover, the governor and the Company of the Colony are demanding two of our Fathers for the fort known as *le Detroit*, situated between the country of the Iroquois and that of the Ottawa... The old missions, Tadoussac and that of the Hurons, are in great need of missionaries."<sup>19</sup> This was in 1702, but the situation was not better in the previous year, when the convoy left for Detroit. Cadillac's fable about the Jesuits being anxious to go to his posts in 1701, is contradicted by the commandant himself in his letter of 1702, where he complained that the Jesuits "make us beseech them too much" to go to Detroit.<sup>20</sup>

There was one man who was anxious to have Jesuits at Detroit:—that man was Cadillac. It is not maligning him to assert that he harbored thoughts of selling brandy to the Indians assembled there; for he still looked upon a post in New France as a means of getting rich quickly, and the quickest way toward wealth was to sell brandy; but he also knew that the Jesuits would never countenance it. In 1702, he wrote that he was satisfied with Father De l'Halle, but there should be Recollects as well as Jesuits at the post. The first would take care of the garrison; the others of the Indians because "there is nothing so sweet as liberty of conscience; for my part, I think this especially necessary in these distant places." We can easily understand what that meant, and we can easily understand that on Cadillac's arrival at Montreal "a change was made." Who made the change is not said; Cadillac asserted that the Jesuits were convinced that he had done it, and it is difficult to see who else it could have been.

The return of Father Vaillant to Montreal added fuel to the flames; here was the proof of the "conspiracy hatched with Father Bouvart before Vaillant's return departure" to Detroit. There is fortunately abundant documentation showing that in fact there was no conspiracy. Father Germain wrote to Cadillac as follows: "I am not writing to any of our Fathers, because I have no doubt that Father Vaillant will have set out to return here before Madame de Lamothe arrives at Detroit, and I do not know whether he left some Jesuit in his place."<sup>21</sup> This is one of the fifteen letters exchanged

<sup>19</sup> Crépéul to Thyrsus González, October 28, 1702, Jesuit Archives, Rome, *Gallia*, 110, II, 258. "Jam enim 3<sup>us</sup> est annus ex quo nullus Societatis ill[ic] ad no[s] [a]ccessit. Numquam tamen fuit nobis magis aliquod hujusmodi subsidium." Germain to *id.*, November 10, 1702.

<sup>20</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, September 25, 1702, MPHS, 33: 150.

<sup>21</sup> Germain to Cadillac, August 25, 1701, Margry, 5: 211. These letters are translated in MPHS, 33: 104 ff.

between the Jesuits of Canada and the commandant of Detroit. All these letters were commented upon by Cadillac afterwards, when he wanted to justify himself with the minister in Paris.

This fourth letter is from Father Germain, a former official of the Society, a good professor of theology and a man who is upright and pious; he is in fact a friend of Mme. de Lamothe (which may indeed cause him to be sent back to France). At the end of this letter, he is writing candidly of what he knew, without adverting that his superior of Quebec [Father Bouvart] had promised M. de Lamothe to let him have Father Vaillant to start a mission at Detroit. For, it is evident from this letter that the return of this Father was expected even before his departure from Quebec, and that this action was taken only in order to hoodwink M. de Lamothe and with the intention of causing the failure of this establishment.

As usual, these comments do not square with the facts. When Vaillant went with M. de Lamothe, it was understood that he would not stay at Detroit; everybody knew this, the superior of the Jesuits, the governor, the intendant, and Cadillac himself. The missionaries at Michilimackinac had asked for Father Vaillant, and they had been given to understand that he would go to help them.<sup>22</sup> Soon after the departure of Father Vaillant from Detroit, Lamothe wrote to Father Marest complaining that he had been deceived. Marest answered: "With regard to the return of Father Vaillant, it ought not to have surprised you, for I have been assured that it had been arranged from down there [Quebec]; and that M. de Caillières was expecting him at Catarocouy [Fort Frontenac]."<sup>23</sup> "This letter," commented Cadillac, "evidently proves that the return of Father Vaillant, who had been given to M. de Lamothe to begin his mission at Detroit, had been arranged in Quebec... It discloses one more thing, for it seems that this decision was taken in agreement with M. de Caillières, which is unbelievable."

Not only is it believable, but that is exactly what took place in Quebec. It was safe to speak of this action as "unbelievable," for Caillières was dead when Cadillac wrote these remarks. It is likely that one of the reasons why he took Father De l'Halle with him was because he knew that Father Vaillant was to go back, and he also knew that neither the king nor the minister would agree to leave workmen and soldiers without a priest. In 1703, realizing that the Jesuits would not come to Detroit, he wrote a long letter to Pontchartrain, complaining of the Jesuits' going back on their word.

<sup>22</sup> Carheil to Tonti, June 17, 1702, Margry, 5: 236.

<sup>23</sup> Marest to Cadillac, October 8, 1701, Margry, 5: 215.



You were good enough to write to me that the king wants the mission of Detroit to be administered by the Jesuit Fathers, and that their superior of Quebec would grant me some who would be more in sympathy with me than Father Vaillant had been.

It seems that your orders should be sufficient to induce their superior to provide promptly for that mission, especially after the special favor which you have done him by approving of Father Vaillant remaining in this country after having opposed the will of His Majesty as he has done.<sup>24</sup>

The letter to which Cadillac refers was Pontchartrain's answer to his own of August 31, 1701.<sup>25</sup> The contravention of the king's orders can only refer to the spreading of disaffection among the men of Detroit. The minister's answer was as follows:

I was surprised when I read what you wrote about the conduct of Father Vaillant, Jesuit. I made known to his superiors the intention of the king ordering him back to France.<sup>26</sup> However, as I would like you to keep on good terms with his Society, which it seems you have attacked somewhat inconsiderately, I am sending a letter to MM. de Callières and de Beauharnois that His Majesty approves of Father Vaillant's remaining in Canada, if you ask for him. Act in such a manner that the Jesuits become your friends, and do not hurt them. Moreover, His Majesty wants the missions around Detroit to be taken care of by the Jesuits. They will give you a missionary who will be more in sympathy with you than Father Vaillant.<sup>27</sup>

In the case of the Vaillant-Cadillac affair, as in many other cases where the Jesuits are concerned, Margry deliberately omitted documents which explain what appears puzzling in the relations between the missionaries and his hero. In his compilation, he published Cadillac's letters to Pontchartrain as well as another letter addressed to La Touche.<sup>28</sup> In the volume of the French Archives,

<sup>24</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, August 31, 1703, Margry, 5: 302.

<sup>25</sup> Pontchartrain to Cadillac, May 6, 1702, AC, B, 23: 77v-78v.

<sup>26</sup> "Father Gouye doubtless mentioned to you what I told him was the intention of the king with regard to Father Vaillant, who very thoughtlessly made use of all kinds of means to bring about the fall of the settlement His Majesty thought necessary to begin on the Strait. His Majesty desires his return to France, and as he wants a Jesuit Father to be in charge of the spiritual of the settlement, he wishes that you send another Jesuit giving him the necessary instructions to cooperate to the success of the settlement." Pontchartrain to Lamberville, May 3, 1702, AM, B 2, 161: 333.

<sup>27</sup> Pontchartrain to Cadillac, May 6, 1702, AC, B 23: 78.—In the margin of the abstract from Cadillac's letter where he had complained of Father Vaillant (AC, C 11A, 19: 93), Pontchartrain had written: "f[ai]re revenir le P. Vaillant en fr[ance] y envoyer d'autres."

<sup>28</sup> Cadillac to La Touche, August 31, AC, C 11E, 14: 136-137v, printed in Margry, 5: 336-340; extracts from Cadillac's letter to Pontchartrain, August 31, 1703, with notes by Champigny, AC, C 11E, 14: 138-150; Cadillac to Pontchartrain, August 31, 1703, AC, C 11E, 14: 153-164v. The first and third letter are translated in Sheldon, *History of Michigan*, 101 ff; and in MPHS, 161 ff.



from which these two letters are taken, there is a memorandum written by La Touche to the minister which explains certain difficulties. "This is the original letter of Lamothe Cadillac, all the documents are annexed to it. I think all should be sent to M. de Champigny that he may examine it carefully, send his opinion in detail, and give his reasons."<sup>29</sup> The whole letter, however, was not sent, but rather an abstract of it, and in the margin were written Champigny's comments. The résumé of the paragraph of Cadillac's letter of August 3, 1703, quoted above reads as follows: "The superior of the Jesuits was pledged to carry out this agreement, because he knew the intention of His Majesty in this respect, and because my Lord [Pontchartrain] had done a special favor to Father Vaillant who had contravened the order of the king." Champigny, who was in Quebec at the time, commented thus:

There is no proof that he [Bouvar] did not carry it out. With regard to Father Vaillant, he was the treasurer of the house [college of Quebec]. There was no other Jesuit to give Sieur de Lamothe; Vaillant was only to stay until another Jesuit were sent to take his place; if he came back, it was because there was a Recollect at Detroit who could easily take care of the thirty men then at the post. Sieur de Lamothe cannot know whether my Lord had granted a special favor to Father Vaillant. He complained about this Jesuit in 1701; in the following year, my Lord gave orders to send Father Vaillant back to France; this would have been done, if he had not been at the time in the Iroquois mission where his presence is very necessary. If Sieur de Lamothe knew that My Lord had forgiven Father Vaillant, he could only have known this in 1702. The mailships did not arrive in Canada until October, and his [Cadillac] letter in which he says to my Lord that the superior of the Jesuits pledged himself to carry out the agreement, because my Lord forgave Father Vaillant is dated of the month of August 1702. He must then have guessed that my Lord had granted the favor. I never heard it said in Canada that Sieur de Lamothe complained about Father Vaillant, I only learned of it in 1702 from the letters of my Lord.<sup>30</sup>

Champigny's reasoning on this latter point is not quite correct. Cadillac was told in the letter of May 6, 1702, that the favor was left to him. The letter arrived at Quebec in October, and on September 25, 1702, he wrote to Pontchartrain: "I have carried out submissively what you wrote concerning Father Vaillant [about the favor]. This was done after my letter was written, in the presence of his superior, and of Father Germain. Father Vaillant set out for the Seneca, four hours after the arrival of the king's ship."<sup>31</sup> Father Vaillant did not leave "four hours" after the arrival of the

<sup>29</sup> MPHS, 33: 181.

<sup>30</sup> AC, C 11E, 14: 138.

<sup>31</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, September 25, 1702, MPHS, 33: 151.

king's ship; for he left in August long before Cadillac knew of the "favor" granted by Pontchartrain.

Perhaps, it might be said that Father Vaillant should have waited until another Jesuit arrived from Michilimackinac; but aside from the fact that the Jesuits of Michilimackinac had themselves asked for help, Vaillant had been ordered by Callières to return by way of Fort Frontenac. It is doubtful whether Callières would have sent Vaillant back to France without further instructions from Paris; and it is certain that he would not have sent him back merely because the missionary had left Detroit, for his return had been arranged before the departure of the convoy. Champigny also noted that he had not heard of the commandant's complaints against Vaillant until 1702; yet Cadillac wrote to Pontchartrain that he had complained to the governor general in 1701. There is no mention of Vaillant in Cadillac's letter to Callières and Champigny, since he knew better than to complain to the governor general who had arranged for his return.

As for the disaffection which Cadillac claimed to have been spread among the builders of Detroit: first of all, according to their own contract these men would have lost a year's salary, if they had returned to Montreal after six weeks. Secondly, it is probable that Vaillant traveled with Charconacle from Detroit to Fort Frontenac, whence the officer proceeded to Quebec.<sup>32</sup> If Cadillac had complained against Vaillant in the letter which he brought to Callières and Champigny, they would have asked Charconacle about it, in which case the conduct of Father Vaillant would have been known in Canada in 1701. In fact, in the summary of the letter which he sent to Callières and Champigny Vaillant's name does not even appear; nor is there any mention of the Jesuit in the letter of Tonti which was brought to Quebec by Charconacle himself.

All this detailed evidence clearly shows that the return of Father Vaillant was not planned for the purpose of wrecking Detroit; that there was no "conspiracy" on the part of the Jesuits to ruin Cadillac's village; that Vaillant did not stir up discontent at Detroit; and that Cadillac did not write to Callières as he says he did, for Vaillant could have appealed to Charconacle who had just returned from Detroit. There is finally one last bit of evidence in the form of a letter from Father Vaillant written at Fort Frontenac on his way back to Quebec.

<sup>32</sup> Vaillant wrote to Cadillac from Fort Frontenac on September 23, 1701; Charconacle arrived at Quebec on October 4.

Our fortunate meeting at Fort Frontenac with Mme de Lamothe gives me a good opportunity of thanking you very humbly for all the courtesies with which you have overwhelmed me this summer, both during our voyage to, and at Detroit. I beg of you to be so good as to continue to grant them to the Father who is to come down from Michilimackinac to Detroit; for I have no doubt you will have one there very soon. I met the Huron Quarante Sols on Lake Erie, who assured me that the Hurons were coming to settle near you this very autumn without fail. With regard to the Iroquois whom we met on the way, we did not find them much opposed to your settlement; some even showed pleasure, because when hunting in the Lake Erie country, they will find at Detroit all they want in exchange for the skins of roe-buck, stag, and hind; so all you need is to have plenty of merchandise at a low price. I am not telling you the news we have heard here, because Mme de Lamothe informed us of it; she will tell it to you as exactly as I could write it.<sup>33</sup>

Besides showing the gratitude of Vaillant for kindnesses received and an interest in the prosperity of the post he supposedly attempted to wreck, this letter confirms what Champigny wrote: Vaillant was to return and another Jesuit was to come from Michilimackinac. In the note appended to this letter by Cadillac himself, there is not one word about disaffection; yet, here, if anywhere, would have been the place for the commandant to contrast his own conduct with that of the Jesuit.

This sixth letter is from Father Vaillant and proves the deference of M. de Lamothe for him; the matter was public and could not be denied. No doubt this Father had his cue from his superior of Quebec, and he is trying to deceive M. de Lamothe when he writes that one of the Fathers of Michilimackinac is to come to Detroit, apparently to replace him, which was not carried out.

Father Bouvart, the superior of Quebec, also wrote to Cadillac in April 1702, thanking him on behalf of Father Vaillant who was praising Lamothe for the singular kindness shown him while in Detroit. Bouvart repeated what Vaillant had said about some Jesuit from Michilimackinac coming to take his place, hoping that Fathers de Carheil and Marest had by this time moved to Detroit with their Indians. In the note to this letter, there is not one word about the manner Vaillant had allegedly repaid all these kindnesses.<sup>34</sup>

Now that we know what did not happen during the six weeks following the arrival of the convoy at Detroit, let us see what actually happened. The Canadians who had accompanied the convoy were men of tough fibre, but even to them the outlook at Detroit

<sup>33</sup> Vaillant to Cadillac, September 23, 1701, Margry, 5: 213 f.

<sup>34</sup> Bouvart to Cadillac, April 20, 1702, Margry, 5: 223 f.

appeared very bleak, and they could not live on Cadillac's poetry. That they were dissatisfied is certain, not because of what Father Vaillant said, but because provisions failed as soon as the convoy arrived. Wrote Lamothe: "All this undertaking [the building at Detroit] was carried out with three months' provisions, which I took when I left Montreal, and which were consumed in the course of the journey."<sup>35</sup> And Tonti added that "vivres avoient manqué des en arrivant."

Tonti himself had been dispatched to Michilimackinac to buy some Indian corn. In October, Callières, who had heard that no corn would be found at Michilimackinac, made the Seneca Indians promise to bring some to Detroit.<sup>36</sup> Callières and Champigny wrote to Pontchartrain at the beginning of October, that "since the departure of Sieur de Lamothe, we sent him two canoes loaded with victuals and merchandise for he might need them";<sup>37</sup> and more food was sent to Detroit with the canoes bringing Mesdames de Lamothe and Tonti to the post. At the end of October, Cadillac sent Tonti to Fort Frontenac "to get some refreshments."<sup>38</sup> Amid such privations, the discontent of the workmen can easily be imagined. It seems that some wanted to return with Father Vaillant, but, as Cadillac wrote in his letter to Callières, because dwellings were not very much advanced "he was obliged to keep nearly all his men, trying to finish the buiding of the fort before winter sets in."<sup>39</sup>

In a letter of 1702, that is to say, one year after the beginning of Detroit, Cadillac speaks of the progress made. A résumé of this letter was annotated by Pontchartrain, who wrote in the margin: This is a romantic description. He is the only one who speaks thus about that country. In their speeches to M. de Callières, the Indians said that the land was under water and worthless; to make it productive, irrigation would be necessary, which, the Indians say, they are unable to do.<sup>40</sup> Those who are there are forced to fetch corn from two hundred leagues away. The only game is thirty leagues from the post.<sup>41</sup>

Cadillac, who saw everything on a grand scale, asked not to have the post manned with a mere garrison, else it would have been better never to have started it. Pontchartrain tersely wrote in the

<sup>35</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, September 25, 1702, MPHS, 33: 139.

<sup>36</sup> Callières to Pontchartrain, October 4, 1701, Margry, 5: 191.

<sup>37</sup> Callières and Champigny to Pontchartrain, October 5, 1701, Margry, 5: 188.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* to *id.*, November 6, 1701, Margry, 5: 200.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* to *id.*, October 5, 1701, Margry, 5: 189.

<sup>40</sup> Parolles des Ottawas... July 5, 1702, AC, F 3, 8: 310 f.

<sup>41</sup> AC, C 11A, 20: 130v.

margin: "M. de Callières had written that he had to recall half the garrison lest they starve to death."<sup>42</sup>

It is small wonder that the men who had been engaged in 1701 wished to return, and there was no need of Father Vaillant to fan the dissatisfaction. Cadillac wrote somewhere that he staked his life on the success of the venture. From the beginning, it seems that the Detroit settlement would be a fiasco: no Indians had come yet; the Jesuit missionary had gone; Cadillac had by now received two rather chilly letters from the missionaries of Michillimackinac; the men grumbled because they were hungry; and the soldiers had been recalled because they were starving. It looked as though Cadillac's staked life would soon be forfeited.

We have been told repeatedly that Cadillac did not want Jesuits at Detroit, yet for three years, he moved heaven and earth to secure them for his village. The only reason which can account for his efforts in this direction is that he had at heart the success of his undertaking, that is, his personal profits; for when his pocketbook was concerned, Cadillac forgot his hatred. There was one Jesuit in particular, Father Jean Enjalran,<sup>43</sup> of whom he spoke in glowing terms:

He is one of the most able Jesuits, and the only one who had mastered the Ottawa and Algonquian tongues. Because of his great influence over the minds of the Indians, he was chosen to summon all the tribes to the general peace which was concluded at Montreal. He expresses himself clearly as to the importance of the settlement of Detroit, and proves in his letter of August 27, that it is important to unite all the missions as well as the other posts to this one . . .

But because this Father stated his opinion about it in public, the [superiors of the] Society [of Jesus] in Canada sent him back to France; they will doubtless find some other excuse for sending him away.<sup>44</sup>

Again commenting on a letter written a few days later, Cadillac noted:

This Father had just passed through all the missions and he admits that the whole Upper Country stands in need of reorganization. He is indeed right. His uprightness has made him hated by his fellow Jesuits who got rid of him against all justice. His letter also proves that M. de Callières had cast his eyes upon him to be in charge of all the missions, but it had doubtless been a part of the policy of the governor general to yield

<sup>42</sup> AC, C 11A, 20: 133v. Cf. Pontchartrain to Cadillac, June 20, 1703, AC, B 23: 228v.

<sup>43</sup> The missionary spelled his name as in the text.

<sup>44</sup> Cadillac's annotations to Enjalran's letter of August 27, 1701, Margry, 5: 208 f.



to the torrent, and to sacrifice this good laborer so necessary in the Lord's vineyard to the envy of his colleagues. No one has ever understood the character of the Indians better than this Father, nor has anyone had more influence over their minds, but his crime consisted in having admitted that M. de Lamothe's plan was wonderful; and to that end he writes that he will take pleasure in assisting him in his glorious enterprise.<sup>45</sup>

These comments are not very reliable. Not only Enjalran, but Marest and Carheil, or for that matter any other Jesuit in Canada, would have gone to Detroit if he had been ordered by his superiors. The reason why Enjalran was sent back to France is not because he praised Cadillac's Detroit venture; the letters of the other missionaries including those of the superior of the mission had also commended the Detroit project. When Enjalran first wrote to the commandant, on August 7, the peace had been signed only three days earlier, and everything was so unsettled that Enjalran could not foresee how the general powwow would end. The postscript written three weeks later, on August 27, speaks of the intrigues against Detroit that were rife in Montreal, namely, on the part of the shareholders of the Company of the Colony and of the merchants. What the Court had decided about Detroit, whether the monopoly of trade would be given to the Company of the Colony or whether the king would keep it, was still unknown. Three days after having written the postscript to his letter of August 7, Enjalran wrote to Cadillac from Three Rivers:

I am just meeting Madame de Lamothe who is quite resolved to go to Detroit. I should have been very much pleased if the intention to send me in your direction had permitted me to accompany her. No decision can be made regarding the importance of the mission at the post you are to establish, until steps have been taken with regard to the other missions; for the whole Upper Country needs reorganization. Our governor, after having heard me on the matter, thought I should be able to help in what pertains to my ministry, when we learn what the intentions of the Court are. Should we learn them early enough, I might still be with you before the winter, and I should be very glad to help you in your glorious undertaking, and to manifest the feelings of esteem with which I am, etc.<sup>46</sup>

When the ships finally arrived at Quebec, what Cadillac had feared had come to pass:—Detroit had been given to the Company of the Colony. We have just heard him say that Enjalran was sent back to France because he was in favor of Detroit. Another reason, but perhaps not much better, is given by Rochemonteix.

<sup>45</sup> Cadillac's annotations to Enjalran's letter of August 30, 1701, *Ibid.*, 212 f.

<sup>46</sup> Enjalran to Cadillac, August 30, 1701, Margry, 5: 211 f.



The Jesuits were far from being in agreement with regard to the timeliness and usefulness of Detroit. Father Enjalran considered it the head of all the western posts and sincerely wished it to succeed. He even desired to be sent thither, and this was also M. de Callières' wish; but Father Bouvart opposed it, because Father Enjalran was not in great sympathy with the Ottawa missionaries; above all, he had ideas different from theirs. He was, as one would say today, broadminded, tolerant, less severe than his brethren in the West with regard to the abuses of the trade and the licentiousness of the *coureurs de bois*. He was a practical man; he knew Ottawa and Algonquian perfectly; he had an undeniable influence over the Indians, and he did not think these should be unduly confined, nor be prevented from learning French and from adapting themselves to European customs. Since the Ottawa missionaries did not share his views, Father Dablon was forced to recall him from Michilimackinac to Quebec in 1688; thence he embarked for France on August 21, of the same year. He only reappeared in Canada toward the end of the century. Would it not have been imprudent, however great the desire of the governor general and of M. de Lamothe may have been, to have sent him to Detroit and to have entrusted to him the spiritual direction of this fort?<sup>47</sup>

All of this is sheer surmise. Rochemonteix' proof for the statement concerning Enjalran's character is supposedly given in a letter of Father Bouvart to Father General in Rome dated 1701. I did not find this letter; but I found one dated October 6, 1701, in which Father Enjalran is not even mentioned.<sup>48</sup> As for Dablon recalling him in 1688, there is this to be said: in the archives there is a gap of fourteen years, 1679 to 1693, during which there is no letter in existence sent by the Jesuits of New France.

So far as we know, what actually happened in 1688 was this. Enjalran had previously taken a prominent part in the campaign of Denonville of 1687, who wrote as follows to the minister:

We had five or six men killed on the spot, French and Indians, and about twenty wounded, among the first of whom was the Reverend Father Enjalran, superior of all the Ottawa missions, by a very severe gunshot. It is a great misfortune that this wound will prevent him from going back again, for he is a man of capacity and of great influence, who had conducted everything well at Michilimackinac and to whom the country is under vast obligations. For had it not been for him, the Iroquois would have been long since established at Michilimackinac.<sup>49</sup>

Denonville evidently realized from the nature of the wound that

<sup>47</sup> Rochemonteix, 3: 511 f.

<sup>48</sup> Jesuit Archives, Rome, *Gallia*, 110, 1, 93 f.

<sup>49</sup> Denonville to Seignelay, August 25, 1687, NYCD, 9: 338. Cf. Denonville's memoir of October, 1687, *ibid.*, 365, and Charlevoix, Shea's edition, 3: 288.—Enjalran was "a man to whom the country owes a great debt, for he always kept harmony among the Indians." L. H. de Baugy, *Journal d'une expédition contre les Iroquois*, Paris, 1883, 100.

Enjalran's days as a missionary in the West were over.<sup>50</sup> In 1688, he was in Quebec waiting for a ship that would bring him to France.<sup>51</sup> A letter of Tronson to Dollier de Casson states: "Father Enjalran wrote from La Rochelle, whence he went to a spa without passing through this city [Paris]. In the present state of affairs, there is no likelihood that he will be called to give information about the Ottawa missions to the Court, any more than about the rest of Canada."<sup>52</sup> The present state of affairs referred to by Tronson was the war of the League of Augsburg, which had begun in the preceding year.

After this, Father Enjalran's name drops out of the colonial records, until its reappearance eleven years later, when it is found appended to the preliminaries of the peace treaty of Montreal on September 8, 1700.<sup>53</sup> Why his name does not appear in the catalogue of 1700, we do not know. Perhaps he was only sent on a visit, and his stay was made subject to the approval of Father Bouvart. Callières who had the highest regard for Enjalran sent him to Michilimackinac toward the end of September 1700. He was to persuade the Western Indians to come to Montreal with their Iroquois prisoners and also to attend to the general meeting in which the treaty of peace was to be ratified by all the Indians.<sup>54</sup> Courtemanche was the official delegate of the governor, but Enjalran was sent with the officer because he was "a man of very distinguished merit, who thoroughly understood the character of all the Indian nations."<sup>55</sup> When they arrived at Michilimackinac, on October 30, the Indians had left for the winter hunt. While Courtemanche was making a tour of the various western posts, Enjalran remained at Michilimackinac "to dispose the Indians of that place to follow my [Courtemanche] orders."<sup>56</sup>

He adroitly conciliated all of them and forced the most influential to send deputies to the various tribes, so that all would come to Montreal. He made

<sup>50</sup> Beschefer to Villermont, September 19, 1687, merely mentions that a Jesuit was wounded. JR, 63: 274. Cf. St. Vallier, *Estat Present de L'Eglise et de la colonie francaise dans la Nouvelle France*, Paris, 1688, 92; Belmont, *Histoire du Canada*, 24; C. C. Le Roy de Bacqueville de la Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4 vols., Paris, 1722, 2: 208; Lahontan, *Nouveaux Voyages... dans l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 2 vols., La Haye, 1703, 1: 99.

<sup>51</sup> Enjalran left Quebec on August 21, 1688, with Joutel, Douay, and Cavelier. Margry, 3: 532.

<sup>52</sup> Tronson to Dollier de Casson, May 1, 1689, no. 406.

<sup>53</sup> Conference between Callières and the Iroquois deputies, NYCD, 9: 720.

<sup>54</sup> Callières to Pontchartrain, October 16, 1700, *ibid.*, 712.

<sup>55</sup> La Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4: 175.

<sup>56</sup> Callières to Pontchartrain, October 4, 1701, AC, C 11A, 19: 114v.

such an impression on them that in spite of the evil dispositions of a few chiefs who wanted to keep the Iroquois prisoners, he forced them to bring even these down to Montreal.<sup>57</sup>

"We like him," said Jean Leblanc, an Ottawa chief speaking in the name of the western tribes, "because we have noticed that he always takes our side." In the same speech, he begged Callières to send Enjalran to Michilimackinac, "but as he is getting on in years [he was 60] we are asking you for [Nicolas] Perrot, as his helper in all occasions when we shall be in need" of the missionary.<sup>58</sup> Courtemanche and Enjalran left Michilimackinac on July 5, 1701, with a fleet of 186 canoes full of western braves, and beached their canoes at Montreal three weeks later.<sup>59</sup>

It is easy to understand why Cadillac wanted a Jesuit with such an influence over the Indians. En route to Detroit, he wrote to the missionary who answered: "I do not know what reply to make to the letter I have received from you; I have at the same time received an honor which I value greatly for the confidence which you show you have in me."<sup>60</sup> The mark of confidence was probably that the Jesuit should accompany Mesdames de Lamothe and Tonti to Detroit; Callières, however, evidently did not wish to take any decision until he had heard from the Court and knew who was to be the proprietor of Detroit, the king or the Company of the Colony.

For a man who was so absolutely opposed to having Jesuits at Detroit, Cadillac was acting queerly. As already mentioned, he knew that Vaillant was to return. Why should he have written on his way to Detroit to Fathers Marest and Carheil to come to the post? And why should he have asked Carheil to come? For Vaillant also knew Huron, and Carheil did not know Ottawa.

We have treated at length of the difficulties between Carheil and Cadillac.<sup>61</sup> Marest, as we shall see, had trouble too. Joseph Marest was born in 1653; he entered the Jesuit Order at eighteen, and was sent to Canada in 1688. After spending two years at Sil-lery, near Quebec, where he learned Algonquian, he was sent to the West.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>57</sup> La Potherie, *Voyage*, 4: 175.

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 4: 257.

<sup>59</sup> Callières to Pontchartrain, October 4, 1701, AC, C 11A, 19: 116. According to Charlevoix (Shea's edition, 5: 143), 144 canoes left Michilimackinac, thirty had to put back on account of sickness. The contingent that arrived at Montreal numbered more than 800 Indians. La Potherie's memoir of 1702 in BRH, 22 (1916): 224.

<sup>60</sup> Enjalran to Cadillac, August 7, 1701, Margry, 5: 207.

<sup>61</sup> MID-AMERICA, 27 (1945): 194 ff.

<sup>62</sup> Rochemonteix, 3: 480, note 1.

Before recounting Cadillac's further adventures, we must say a word about the data we have concerning them. All the statements in the correspondence between Cadillac and Marest can be checked on independent evidence; but with regard to the speeches of the Indians, there is some uncertainty. Those made to Callières at Montreal were public, whereas those made to Cadillac were allegedly made at Detroit. We do not know who Cadillac's interpreters were, nor how much he may have suppressed or added to the speeches. At any rate, if the Indians spoke differently at Montreal and at Detroit, the Jesuits can hardly be blamed for that.

In his letters to Carheil and Marest, Cadillac had asked to have some wheat sent.<sup>63</sup> For many years, said Carheil in his answer, he had wished for a post on the Strait, and was glad to learn that a beginning had been made. All the Indians of Michilimackinac were then at Montreal for the signing of the peace; after consulting with Callières they will decide whether they are to leave Michilimackinac and whither they are to go. As for himself, he will follow them.<sup>64</sup> Three days later, Marest wrote to Cadillac praising the commandant for having decided that, as Cadillac had told him in his letter, there would be no brandy trade at Detroit. He then added: "We are expecting the return of our Indians at any time; then we shall know their real resolutions, and the intention of M. de Callières and of our superior"; as for him, he is ready to leave as soon as word came from his superior.<sup>65</sup>

Cadillac commented on this letter as follows: "In the second letter, Father Marest, the missionary of the Ottawa, is only acting pharisaically, for he had refused to obey the orders of the governor general, or even those which he received (at least according to all appearances) from his superior at Quebec."

Once again, Cadillac's comment is quite unfounded. There never was an order from Callières or from Bouvart. Even if Callières had wanted to, he would not have dared to order the Indians to abandon Michilimackinac. The actual facts can be gathered from La Potherie and from the minutes of the interviews between the Western Indians and the governor general.<sup>66</sup>

When Courtemanche and Enjalran left for the West in Sep-

<sup>63</sup> Margry, 5: 254.

<sup>64</sup> Carheil to Cadillac, July 25, 1701, Margry, 5: 204 f.

<sup>65</sup> Marest to Cadillac, July 28, 1701, Margry, 205 f.

<sup>66</sup> AC, F 2, 1: 255-268v; printed in BRH, 22 (1916): 214-226, under the title "Un mémoire de Le Roy de la Potherie sur la Nouvelle France adressé à M. de Pontchartrain, 1701-1702." Margry printed an extract of this memoir, 5: 180-186.

tember 1700, they were instructed to demand the return of all the Iroquois prisoners, and to tell the Western Indians that they would find their own tribesmen now in the hands of the Iroquois. A Poto-watomi chief, Ounanguicé,<sup>67</sup> warned his fellow Indians not to bring all the Iroquois prisoners at once, but his warning had gone unheeded. The other embassy that was sent to the Iroquois country, was composed of Maricourt, Joncaire, and Father Bruyas. "Maricourt who was the head of this embassy had positive and secret orders from M. de Callières. He brought back our French prisoners, but none of our Indian allies. When more than 800 of our allies . . . arrived at Montreal, and when they learned that the Iroquois had brought none of their prisoners, nobody could have been more surprised than they were."

They voiced their complaints and reproaches in no uncertain terms.<sup>68</sup> Their leader, the Rat, was particularly vigorous in his denunciations. Callières promised not to hand over the prisoners to the Iroquois until these had brought the Ottawa, but the Western Indians "were not satisfied with this answer. Our affairs were in a very bad state, and if the Rat had not died four days later, it would have been fearful." He was angry for "having been duped by M. de Callières." In a council, he reproached the governor for "having found the secret of redeeming the French; and he could see how Callières had sacrificed the interests of his tribe and those of all the allies." After the death of their leader, the Western Indians handed over to Callières all the Iroquois prisoners. The Iroquois envoys agreed to "hand over to Joncaire all prisoners of the allies who would go to the fort of M. de Lamothe."<sup>69</sup> When Joncaire once more went to the Iroquois country, they gave him four prisoners and refused to force the others to leave." It is quite clear that under these conditions, Callières could not order the Western Indians to go to Detroit after he had so signally deceived them.

In the conferences with the Western Indians, Detroit was specifically mentioned; they were told that the new post was all to their advantage, "but they did not pay much attention" to what was said to them.<sup>70</sup> The day after his arrival, Chichikatalo, a Miami

<sup>67</sup> On this Indian cf. La Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4: 206, 208, 220, 245 f.

<sup>68</sup> Meeting of Callières and the Western Chiefs of July 29, 1701, AC, F 3, 8: 266-270. They had arrived on the previous day, Callières to Pontchartrain, October 4, 1701, AC, C 11A, 19: 114.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4: 237.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 4: 227.



chief, told Callières: "We desire to go to the St. Joseph River, and we ask you to invite all those of our tribe to assemble there."<sup>71</sup> Callières did so in an address to all the Western Indians before these returned to their country:

As for what you are asking me, Chichikatalo, that the other Miami villages go to the St. Joseph River, you may assure all those of your tribe that they will please me if they join with you, because I am convinced, now that peace is concluded, that they will live more happily there than in any other place . . . Since I have learned that several among you, Hurons, Ottawa, and others, had the intention of leaving Michilimackinac to settle on the Strait, I have sent Sieurs de Lamothe and Tonti this spring to begin a settlement there, thus giving them time to build, and to enable them to protect you from the beginning of this winter as well as to supply your needs at a reasonable price.<sup>72</sup>

In the light of all this, Cadillac's reference to the "orders" of Callières seems rather ill-advised. Other documents show what the Indians themselves thought of moving to Detroit. When the Indians from Michilimackinac came again to Montreal in 1702, they declared to Callières that they had resolved not to leave their land, because of the great advantages there. Callières answered them:

You must be convinced of my friendship, I shall always strive to procure what is advantageous for you. This is why I felt obliged last year, when I learned that the land at Michilimackinac was worked out and not longer productive, to propose that you settle on the Strait where the land is not only good, but where game is also abundant. I went to great expense to begin a settlement where you could have what you need. I think that you will consider this affair more carefully, and after you are acquainted with its advantages, you will join those of your nation who are already there.

An Ottawa chief, Manitsegan, answered the governor in the name of all the Western Indians: "8tsik8et alone was personally told to go to the Strait; we were not invited. On the contrary, Reverend Father Enjalran told us last summer not to leave Michilimackinac, where he would come in the autumn." That is to say, Enjalran would have gone if the Detroit post had been given to an individual, or had been made a royal post like Michilimackinac, but when he learned that it was to be given to the Company of the Colony, Callières lost interest; for we should not forget that he was opposed to the monopoly of the Montreal merchants. He answered

<sup>71</sup> Pourparlers entre M. de Callières . . . et les sauvages descendus à Montréal pour parvenir à la ratification de la paix, July 29, 1701, AC, F 3, 8: 263. Cf. the speech as reported in La Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4: 208.

<sup>72</sup> "Il [Callières] encouragea Chichikatalo de rassembler toutes les nations Miamises à cette rivière [St. Joseph] afin de n'y faire qu'un seul établissement." *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4: 255.

by quoting the speeches of August 6, mentioned above. At that date he may have thought that there would be merchandise at Detroit, but by this time most of it had been exchanged for necessary food.

Manit8egan then said:

8tsik8et sent us some tobacco this spring [1702] and told us that we should not move our huts. He knew that Detroit was no place at which to settle: the Indian corn does not grow higher than one cubit, because the land is always wet; this winter he had to go 200 leagues from Detroit to find game;<sup>73</sup> game at Detroit will not last long; and there is no fish which we will never lack at Michilimackinac; hence we cannot leave Michilimackinac.

Callières answered that perhaps 8tsik8et did not see the whole country around the Strait; if the land near the fort is not good, better land can be found "a little farther." But Manit8egan was not convinced:

We see very clearly, our father, that it was your good will toward us that caused you to start a settlement on the Strait, and this because you were told that our land at Michilimackinac was exhausted. We have mentioned this fact to the Reverend Jesuit Father [Marest], and said that we wanted to take land across the shore [at Mackinac], three leagues from our villages. The Father told us he would follow us whithersoever we went. Nothing has been decided yet about it. But our plan is still not to go away from Michilimackinac because of the abundant fishing there.<sup>74</sup>

In the circumstances, there seems to be no reason for questioning the sincerity of Manit8egan. The Indian cannot be said to have been influenced by Marest, who was a thousand miles away at the time. He was not courting favor with the governor; on the contrary, his public declaration that Callières had been deceived with regard to the quality of the land around Detroit was certainly not calculated to win favor. Besides, he was merely repeating the advice of an Indian of his tribe who had spent the winter at Detroit.

Besides the Ottawa spokesman, deputies of the Noukens also spoke on this occasion. They said that they had gone to Michilimackinac for fear of their enemies. Callières told them that he had given Sieurs de Lamothe and Tonti as commandants, and these would take care of their affairs. Later in the month of July, other Western Indians arrived at Montreal. The spokesman was

<sup>73</sup> The text has two leagues, an oversight evidently; for if the Indians had only to travel two leagues, they would have no reason for complaining. Cf. the text in AC, C 11A, 20: 130v.

<sup>74</sup> Parolles des Ottawas arrivés à Montreal le 5 juillet [1702], AC, F 3, 8: 310 f.

Longuekam. Le Pesant, Callières told them, had taken land at Detroit; and they should go there also. Longuekam answered the governor general as follows:

It is true that the land of Michilimackinac is not good, but we know where to get some. You tell us to settle at Detroit; but our people who are there have made known to us that the land was worthless and that they will not remain long there. Furthermore there is much water and as we are not accustomed as the French are to make irrigating ditches, we could not grow anything on that land. We know that the Saulteux will not go either, even if you should despatch a canoe for the express purpose of having them go to Detroit.<sup>75</sup>

After such clear statements from the Indians of Michilimackinac, one can judge how much weight is to be attached to Cadillac's comments on the letters he received from the missionaries at the old mission. When he heard from them in August, he realized that the Jesuits would wait for positive orders from Callières. Hence his letter to Pontchartrain of August 31, 1701. In it, without rhyme or reason, he expresses his conviction that the Jesuits will do all they can to wreck his post, "because they do not want to stay, and because they take umbrage at the Recollects and the Priests of the Foreign Missions."<sup>76</sup>

Before examining Cadillac's report of what was said in the councils held at Detroit in October and December, and before comparing what was certainly said in Montreal in August with the Indians' alleged speeches at Detroit, we shall briefly give the contents of two more letters of Marest to Cadillac, which were received before these councils met.

In a letter to Marest, Cadillac complained about Father Vaillant having returned to Quebec. Marest answered that he should not have been surprised, since he knew that Vaillant was not to remain at Detroit. He then replies to Cadillac's question about the attitude of the Ottawa toward Detroit.

I could not tell you what our Ottawa think about Detroit, and I believe that they themselves would have difficulty in saying what they think, for they do not agree. Several fear that, since their slaves [*i.e.*, the Ottawa prisoners] were not returned, which was the most essential article of the peace treaty, the Iroquois intend to deceive them; but if the prisoners are brought this autumn, as they hope, it will calm them somewhat. As for me, I am daily expecting orders from our Reverend Superior [Bouvard], but I do not think I could make any move before next spring. As the matter stands, I could not be useful to the Indians who are firmly resolved

<sup>75</sup> Kiskakons, Sakis, Poux, Puants descendus a Montreal le 23 juillet, 1702, AC, F 3, 8: 312v f.

<sup>76</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, August 31, 1701, AC, C 11A, 19: 93.

to disperse into the woods, each in his own direction, and to get as far as they can. I recommend those who may come to visit you.<sup>77</sup>

This letter is annotated as follows by Cadillac:

This Father is correct in writing that the Indians are not agreed as to the Detroit settlement. The speeches which the Indians made openly in the council [at Detroit] show that it is the missionaries who have set them at variance by the bad impression they gave them, and by threatening the Indians should they come and settle at this post.

Less than a fortnight later, Marest wrote again. The letter was entrusted to Quarante-Sols, who sent his wife with it to Michilimackinac instead of bringing it himself.

Mikinak as well as the other Ottawa who are in your vicinity could have told you what their decision is, if indeed, they have a fixed decision; so it would be useless for me to write about it . . . I have already sent you word that it looks as though I shall make no move this autumn; even if I wanted to, I could not. I may say the same about Father de Carheil. . .<sup>78</sup>

The note of Cadillac to this letter shows what he had in mind from the beginning. He wanted the missionaries to leave Michilimackinac and come to Detroit, thus presenting the Indians with a *fait accompli* when they returned from their winter hunt.

This eighth letter is from Father Marest. It contradicts what he wrote to M. de Lamothe in the second letter dated July 28, 1701, where he said that he was quite ready to set out in the autumn of the same year, if so desired; and he as well as Father de Carheil appear to have been requested to do so by M. de Callières. But all this was done to lull to sleep M. de Lamothe who did not feel like being lulled to sleep.

The letter of July 28 is not contradicted by that of October 20. In July, Marest was waiting for orders, but no orders came. In saying that the missionary was "requested [prié]" by Callières to follow the Indians, Cadillac is quite right, but the governor's request was made conditional upon a free decision, on the part of the Ottawa (in council), to move to Detroit.

Margry gives an account of what took place in the councils held at Detroit between October 3, 1701 and December 7, 1703, together with Cadillac's remarks on what the Indians or the commandant himself said.<sup>79</sup> These remarks are taken from a manuscript in the same volume of the archives which immediately follows the other documents printed by Margry.<sup>80</sup> The manuscript is divided into three columns. On the right-hand side is a synopsis in indirect

<sup>77</sup> Marest to Cadillac, October 8, 1701, Margry, 5: 215 f.

<sup>78</sup> Marest to Cadillac, October 20, 1701, Margry, 5: 217 f.

<sup>79</sup> Margry, 5: 253-300.

<sup>80</sup> AC, C 11E, 14: 94-102.

discourse, of the proceedings which Margry printed in full. The middle column contains Cadillac's remarks, which Margry prints in his notes. The third column of this manuscript is not printed by Margry at all, for it contains the comments of Champigny on the remarks made by Cadillac, and begins as follows: "To give credence to the remarks of Sieur de Lamothe on the speeches of the Indians and to the speeches themselves, one would have to suppose that everything is true, for which I would not vouch."

On arriving at Detroit, an Indian named Otontagan is said to have asked for brandy. In reply, Cadillac gave him a sermon on the evils of strong liquor, which is reported for the edification of Pontchartrain. This Otontagan is La Potherie's Outontaga, "known by the name of Talon and commonly by that of Jean Leblanc, because his mother was very white—a rather rare quality among Indians."<sup>81</sup> Now this same Otontagan who, according to Cadillac, insisted so strongly on having brandy given to his men at Detroit, had made in fact two speeches at Montreal which brought upon himself the wrath of the Hurons. He asked Callières to forbid brandy being taken to Michilimackinac by his braves, and asked permission to pillage any Frenchmen that might be bringing liquor to the West.<sup>82</sup>

But the brandy was relatively a minor issue at present. Cadillac quotes the Indian as asking him the following question: "Is it true that you wrote to the Black Robes of Michilimackinac by the three Iroquois whom you met on Lake St. Clair, when you came with the convoy?" In answer, he denies having written by the Iroquois, but says that he wrote asking for wheat. Yet, said the Indian, the Jesuits showed us a letter from which you warned us not to come to Detroit, lest we die. Cadillac insists that he did not write such a letter, and eloquently exhorted the Indians to listen to the Jesuits only in what pertains to religion: "Onontio is the sole master of the land; I am one of his arms, I only speak to you by his order, and I never lie." The note added to the statement of the Indians says: "It is an invention of Fathers Marest and de Carheil in order the better to convince the Indians."<sup>83</sup>

Cadillac's denial of having written such a letter is quite worthy of belief, but no one can believe that Marest and Carheil read such a letter in the councils. They knew, as Marest himself wrote to

<sup>81</sup> La Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, 4: 202.

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 4: 237, 258. See the speech of this Indian in AC, F 3, 8; 272.

<sup>83</sup> Margry, 5: 255.



Cadillac, that some of their Indians would visit the new post, and they knew the Indian character well enough to realize that everything they said about Detroit would be promptly reported to the commandant. Unless they were out of their minds, they certainly would not read a forged letter of Cadillac to Indians already on their way to Detroit. Champigny saw this:

I do not believe that these Father wanted to dissuade the Indians of Michilimackinac from going to Detroit; those who wanted to go were free to do so, but they did not think that they had to abandon those who wanted to remain at Michilimackinac. As one of these two missionaries is for the Ottawa and the other for the Hurons, on account of the difference of languages and customs, both were apparently obliged to remain with the Indians. My opinion is that such freedom should be left to the Indians, and that some other Jesuit than the two [at Michilimackinac] must be sent to Detroit, or else a priest [of the Foreign Missions] or a Recollect as chaplain of the fort. There is already a Recollect there calling himself chaplain of the troops. If a Jesuit is desired, the Recollect must be recalled, for the two Orders do not get along together, and Detroit is not important enough to have priests of different orders.<sup>84</sup>

Two Hurons whose coming was heralded by Jean Leblanc, followed the Ottawa. Father de Carheil, they said, told them what Father Marest had told the Ottawa, urging them to go to the Miami settlement on the St. Joseph River and to return next spring to Michilimackinac. In the last council, the missionary dissuaded them from going to Detroit, "because you were not beginning a settlement, you had only come to sell your merchandise, and then you would return to Montreal." Before leaving Michilimackinac, the Indians had warned Carheil that they would report everything to Cadillac, and had been forbidden to do so. "We are sent to ask you to give us good lands and show us a place near you where to kindle our fire." In his answer, Cadillac repeated his former harangues about the orders of the king; Carheil was wrong in exhorting them to go to the Miami, "since the governor wants Black and Grey Robes . . . to settle here."<sup>85</sup>

For many reasons this is quite incredible. First, the Hurons and Ottawa did not understand one another, hence these two could not have repeated what Father Marest told the Ottawa. Second, the Indians did not spend the winter in other Indian settlements; they hunted. Third, no one will believe that Carheil should have spoken thus to Quarante-Sols with whom he was continually at odds on the

<sup>84</sup> AC, C 11E, 14: 94v.

<sup>85</sup> Margry, 5: 258.

brandy question. Fourth, the speech of Callières of August 6, 1701, says nothing about Black and Grey Robes.

We cannot check on what was actually said in the Huron council referred to by the two envoys, but even if Carheil had said what they reported, he would only have repeated what everybody in Canada was saying.<sup>86</sup> To disprove that he came to Detroit only to trade, Cadillac, with a sweeping gesture, added: "You can see by the fort which I built, and by the land already cleared that this is an important settlement."<sup>87</sup> Quarante-Sols and Alleyoué, the two envoys, must have been astonished at what they saw. In the following year, the commandant wrote to Pontchartrain that he "hoped" to have sixty arpents of land cleared by 1703.<sup>88</sup> His "land already cleared" in October 1701, is on a par with the "beaux bâtiments"<sup>89</sup> of Detroit about which he had written to Marest at the end of September. "As soon as your tribe arrives," said Cadillac to the two Hurons, "I shall give them a sizeable tract of land and shall show where to build your fort." This is all the more remarkable, because in September 1702, he wrote to Pontchartrain that he had fed 6,000 Indians spending the winter around Detroit,<sup>90</sup> while we know that at the end of October 1701, no natives, except a few roaming hunters, had come near the post.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Loyola University, Chicago

<sup>86</sup> See the letter of the Directors of the Company of the Colony to Pontchartrain, November 10, 1701, Margry, 5: 176.

<sup>87</sup> Margry, 5: 258.

<sup>88</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, September 25, 1702, MPHS, 33: 137.

<sup>89</sup> Marest to Cadillac, October 20, 1701, Margry, 5: 218.

<sup>90</sup> Cadillac to Pontchartrain, September 25, 1702, MPHS, 33: 139.

## Francisco Pablo Vásquez and the Independence of Mexico

A study of Francisco Pablo Vásquez brings to light the crucial problem faced by Mexico during its first decades of mature life, a problem that had to be met successfully if that country would as a true body politic grow in stature and merit the respect of its fellows in the world of nations.

The victory at arms brought separation from Spain in 1821. It contained no guarantee of self-government, or of its parent, self-control. And in spite of the sanguine temper of the newly created ruling class, stark realities commanded hard work and cautious planning. An immense national domain stretched from the Isthmus of Tehuantepec to the Oregon boundary. Fronting northeastward was the young, energetic United States of America. Far to the South, beyond the Central American provinces—soon to go their own way—Bolívar and San Martín strove to wrest the former vice-royalties from imperial bonds and to build permanent nations.

To match this unbalanced external environment, there was an internal setting fit to dismay. Without previous experience in self-management, or any traditions of a legislative congress, without an elected executive, or a system of courts with roots in local justice, definitely marked as colonial in economy, and altogether immature in the practice of political judgment, this brave new people attacked the problem of maintaining their independent life. The attack was complicated by serious weaknesses in the social body, most strikingly in the clerical ranks which experienced a sharp and painful blow during the revolutionary wars, and emerged with scars that indicated trouble in store both for religion and for civil peace.<sup>1</sup> Emotions ran out of hand, a fact demonstrated in the execrable action toward the Spaniards still in Mexico. Hubert Howe Bancroft, writing of the decree of exile of 1827, says that "The constitution was thus shattered, and the germ of illegality became firmly root-

---

Note. This paper was read at the meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, April 23, 1948, at Rock Island, Illinois. Editor.

<sup>1</sup> See "Memorial de Vásquez al Cardenal Secretario de Estado, del 11 de Octubre de 1830," in Luis Medina Ascensio, *La Santa Sede y la Emancipación Mexicana*, Guadalajara, 1946, 212-218, on difficulties of the clergy.

ed."<sup>2</sup> To this people was committed the task of democratic rule, with its heady wine of popular enthusiasms, novel institutions, and a set of leaders more noted for theoretical competence than for proven capacity in administration.

The founders of the nation faced a triple duty: to preserve the military victory, to obtain national recognition from the rest of the world, and, most difficult of all, to work out a permanent form of government. In this labor a large share fell to Francisco Pablo Vásquez.

Vásquez was born at Atlixco, Puebla, on March 2, 1769, of a Spanish father and a Mexican mother. At nine his formal education began in the celebrated Seminario Palafoxiano in the city of Puebla. With a bachelor's degree from the University of Mexico, at the age of twenty he began to teach philosophy at the Puebla college of San Pablo. Continuing in his studies beyond the priesthood, he was promoted to the rank of lecturer in the Councils and Church Discipline. Finally in 1795 the University of Mexico conferred on him the degrees of Licentiate and Doctor of Theology. For a while he served as the parish priest of the church of San Jerónimo, Puebla, and then briefly at that of San Martín Tezmelucán, whence he was moved into Puebla and given charge of the Sagrario adjacent to the cathedral. Here his bishop, Msgr. Campillo, discovered his superior abilities and elevated him to the secretaryship of the episcopal curia. In 1806 he was made cathedral canon, and in 1809 instructor in canon law. Nine years afterward he became master of the cathedral school. Two-thirds of his life were thus given to strictly professional duties.<sup>3</sup>

Puebla, rich, cultured, conservative, largely opposed the first revolutionary movements, and Vásquez, like his bishop and most of the local clergy, kept far off from those turbulent affairs. But Bishop Campillo died in 1813, and he was succeeded by Joaquín Antonio Pérez, a man quite as important as Iturbide in the final overthrow of Spanish rule and a close associate of the latter in establishing the regime of free Mexico.<sup>4</sup> As his secretary, Vásquez came to sympathize fully with the move toward independence. His friend and stalwart supporter, Basilio Arrillaga, S.J., spoke and wrote brilliantly of Mexico's natural right to establish her own sov-

<sup>2</sup> Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Mexico*, San Francisco, 1885, V, 61 note.

<sup>3</sup> Medina Ascensio, 69, is the basis of this paragraph.

<sup>4</sup> Bancroft, IV, V, *passim*; the last survivor of the old line of bishops, Pérez, died in 1827. Medina Ascensio, 30.

ereignty, now that Spain had lost the right to rule.<sup>5</sup> (We recall that a Peruvian Jesuit, Viscardo y Guzmán, with his *Letter to the Spanish Americans by One of their Compatriots*, is said by Carlos Pereyra to have written "The act of independence of Hispanic America.")<sup>6</sup> Both Vázquez and Arrillaga were experts in political theory, and they thought as one on these questions. Hence when his country decided for freedom, Vázquez threw his full weight behind the cause. Bancroft calls him "a most learned and worthy ecclesiastic," which, to those who know Bancroft, is indeed high commendation.<sup>7</sup>

His great opportunity in public service came in the vital efforts of Mexico for international recognition. As soon as Iturbide was overthrown in 1823, a Congress was summoned to frame a republican constitution. Meanwhile, under the authority of the Junta de Gobierno, the Commission on External Affairs drew up plans for foreign relations. As their most necessary business they singled out negotiations with Rome, and this emphasis was kept for twenty years.<sup>8</sup> The instrument chosen in 1825 to implement this policy was Vázquez.

Genaro Estrada, in a fine essay introductory to his collection of presidential messages, writes that

The choice of our foreign representation roused the greatest concern among the ministers. Foreign recognition, and indeed every act of courtesy toward us, was highly esteemed as a sign of trust in our position in the international scene, and of the inadmissibility of our return to colonial subjection.<sup>9</sup>

He lists the three notable achievements of Guadalupe Victoria in international relations as the treaty fixing the boundary with the United States, the first law granting naturalization to foreigners, and the agreement with the Holy See.<sup>10</sup> Victoria himself, in his annual message of January 1, 1826, had this to say:

<sup>5</sup> "Fue mas obra de Dios que de los hombres." See his letter to Pope Pius VII on the liberation of Mexico in Gerardo Decorme, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la República de México durante el Siglo XIX*, Guadalajara, 1914, I, 217-219.

<sup>6</sup> As an indication of the part played by the writings of over fifty Jesuits exiled from the Americas, the letter has been printed many times, more recently in William S. Robertson, *The Rise of the Spanish American Republics*, New York, 1936, 23-24, and lately in John F. Bannon and Peter M. Dunne, *Latin America*, Milwaukee, 1948, 290-291, where a long excerpt is given.

<sup>7</sup> Bancroft, V, 47.

<sup>8</sup> Medina Ascensio, 38.

<sup>9</sup> Genaro Estrada, *Un Siglo de Relaciones Internacionales de México*, Mexico, 1935, x. On the justifications of Vázquez see Medina Ascensio, 70-71.

<sup>10</sup> Genaro Estrada, xii.



The Holy Father, who unites in himself the double role of ruler of Rome and head of the Catholic Church, stirs the veneration and affection of the Mexican people. They look with tender solicitude on their connection with the Father of the Faithful, in objectives purely religious and ecclesiastical. The benevolent letter which Leo XII directed to me on the 29th of last July manifest his ideas of justice and leads us to believe that our envoy, who reached Brussels last year, will be received paternally and pay our tribute to the legitimate successor of Saint Peter.<sup>11</sup>

These lines glossed over a most unpleasant incident, which it was evidently the intention of Victoria to overlook. That was the famous letter of Leo XII entitled *Etsi Jam Diu* of September 24, 1824, in which the Pope urged the Americans to return to the obedience of Ferdinand VII.<sup>12</sup> The letter caused widespread consternation in Mexico, but the men at the head of government wisely preferred to see in it rather the results of Spanish machination than a genuine pontifical commitment. And Guadalupe Victoria instructed his envoy to act in this spirit, to play down its ugly implications, and to urge the Holy Father to go ahead as though he had never written it.<sup>13</sup> President Victoria himself took the lead in this course with a direct letter to Leo XII, and his words as quoted above reveal a remarkable diplomatic success. Leo XII returned a justly welcome reassurance in a letter which has been printed elsewhere.<sup>14</sup> And Vásquez went forward with his business, which was to get the Holy See to appoint bishops, and bishops completely independent of Spain. Of the nine sees, none had an incumbent in 1828.

For a reason rarely noticed by historians, it was essential to the new State that Rome grant the Mexican petition. Of course Roman recognition of new sovereignties traditionally followed the action of other nations, and at this time but few had given the recognition. But this is not the point. The entire Catholic Church in Spanish America was tied up with Spain, and even though the soldiers and viceroys be removed, the religious subordination would remain unless all the peoples abjured their faith, for the Church cannot func-

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 9. The annual messages of the Presidents of Mexico to Congress through the first decade of independence summarize the international efforts of the government.

<sup>12</sup> Medina Ascensio, 71-82, treats the genuine character of this papal Bull and describes in full its effects on Mexican thought.

<sup>13</sup> Such is the tenor of the above quotation. It is amplified in the presidential message of May 23, 1826. Genaro Estrada, 13. Cf. Medina Ascensio, 95-97.

<sup>14</sup> Mariano Cuevas, *História de la Iglesia in México*, El Paso, 1928, V, 168, gives the text in full.

tion without its living authorities. And thus a most intimate dependence on Spain threatened to endure indefinitely, if Rome did not cut the bonds and appoint a new hierarchy without any relation to Madrid. In this light one can see why the Commission on External Affairs put these negotiations before all others. Yet the affair was extremely delicate from the Roman point of view. A real threat developed in Spain against such a move as the creation of an independent Spanish American hierarchy. The court announced its readiness to imitate Henry VIII and secede from the Church, should the Holy Father show Latin America the recognition implied in the appointments of new bishops without the approval of Spain and the dependence of these bishops on the Council of the Indies.<sup>15</sup>

During the wars Spanish American bishops had no communication with the Vatican, and when bishops died or went back to Spain (as some did) there was no way to replace them except through the impossible appeal to Madrid.<sup>16</sup> In this vacuum, with the principle of unity removed, there appeared an offshoot of clerical personalities whose radical doctrines and radically improper behavior grew into a menace both to constitutional life and to popular morals. It would be just as correct to argue that these *clerigazos* were the dynamic of the new secret societies—recall that Padre Alpulche founded the York lodges—as to say that Masonic groups undermined the public life of Mexico, a point in which both Bancroft and Genaro Estrada see eye to eye.<sup>17</sup>

To gain Roman agreement on the bishops, two hurdles had to be crossed: the Holy See must yield, and the Mexican government must compromise, on quite different points. The Pope had to override his fears of Spanish reactions and of the threats of the Holy Alliance, and to appoint bishops with jurisdiction independent of Spain. As is known, Colombia received this grant in 1827, due mainly to the political sagacity of Bolívar.<sup>18</sup> Such wisdom did not persevere in Mexico, whose first petition was simply for the independent bishops, but this was shifted in 1826 to the demand for

<sup>15</sup> W. Eugene Shiels, S.J., "Church and State in the First Decade of Mexican Independence," in *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVIII, (July 1942), 210.

<sup>16</sup> A splendid picture of this incommunication and of its effects in Argentina is drawn by Romulo D. Carbia in *La Revolución de Mayo y la Iglesia*, Buenos Aires, 1945.

<sup>17</sup> See Bancroft, V, 33-34, and Genaro Estrada, ix.

<sup>18</sup> Pedro Leturia, *La Acción diplomática de Bolívar ante Pío VII*, Madrid, 1925.

a concession impossible in that day, the full Patronato as practiced by Spain since 1503.

This abrupt change in his instructions gave to Vázquez in Europe a succession of crises which have led some, even Medina Ascensio, to belittle his diplomatic ability. He had left a small port near Vera Cruz on May 21, 1825, bound for London and ultimately for Rome.<sup>20</sup> His original instructions were to obtain the new bishops and to inquire what patronage, what nominating power the new nation might enjoy.<sup>21</sup> The first delay came when his government insisted that he be received as an agent of a recognized country, when in fact no such recognition had been extended.<sup>22</sup> It was an amateurish display on the part of the Minister of External Relations. But the chief obstacle was his new instruction to demand the complete Patronato grant. He demurred, and used various excuses to bring his government to reconsider, among them a diplomatic sickness. Guadalupe Victoria yielded somewhat. When, however, Guerrero became president in 1829, the pressure became so strong that Vázquez wrote a letter of resignation. Guerrero thus outlined his policy in his annual message to Congress on May 23, 1829:

The Government deplores the death of Pope Leo XII who was just ready to appoint our bishops, as he did for Colombia. We have sent our envoy proper explanations (sic!) or the dictamen of Congress, with positive orders to proceed to Rome and act the character of a public servant as becomes his mission.<sup>23</sup>

Further trouble developed on the other hand, when in 1830 the cardinals of the Consistorial Congregation told Vázquez that they would not approve proprietary bishops but only those *in partibus* or of standing inferior to bishops in fully independent ecclesiastical life. On this occasion he delivered an address that is justly famous both for its prudence and its patriotism.<sup>24</sup> The new Pope, Gregory XVI, who succeeded the short-lived Pius VIII, was known as "the Mexican pope," so carefully had he studied the Mexican problem and so eager was he to settle it.<sup>25</sup> Both he and the government of Mexico, now under Bustamante, yielded to the insistence of Vázquez and his party, and in 1831 the important victory was won. The government nominated Vázquez; the pope tacitly allowed the

<sup>19</sup> Medina Ascensio, 104-111.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 71.

<sup>21</sup> This was the direction laid down for the Roman envoy from the first days of Iturbide until 1826-1827.

<sup>22</sup> Medina Ascensio, 68; Cuevas, V, 180..

<sup>23</sup> Genaro Estrada, 31.

<sup>24</sup> Cuevas, V, 159.

<sup>25</sup> Medina Ascensio, 169.

right of nomination; Vázquez was consecrated as a proprietary bishop and delegated to consecrate five other bishops on his return to Mexico. Though it was indirect, this act was a true recognition of the new nation in the field of greatest consequence both for its public morals and its future independence of Spain. The welcome given Vázquez when he arrived back at Mexico on June 6, 1831, was, we are told, universal.<sup>26</sup> For himself, this was but the beginning of a larger and more difficult task, and he at once took the leadership in the clergy and entered upon his public responsibilities.

The third great problem of independence was to construct a system of government that both mirrored the political character of the people and at the same time gave promise of durability. Now this problem in all its facets had none more striking than the relation between religion and the civil power. Vázquez and his fellow bishops, before they might take possession of their sees, were subjected to an oath that covered two points: they must submit to the laws of Patronato, and, following that, accept such divisions of their dioceses as might be acceptable to the Holy See.<sup>27</sup> They took the oath, on the understanding that the Patronato would be arranged by Concordat with Rome. The clergy did not oppose a Patronato as such, but, as will be shown, they feared the human agencies that would control its destinies.<sup>28</sup> And as years went on, those who stayed out of political party ranks came as a body to stand against it, and for the simple reason that its proponents struck at the very roots of the religious life of the nation.

To draw a parallel, Mexico in 1831 faced a decision very like our own in our first days of independence. It was to decide whether their religion might remain free of governmental regimentation. With us it was Virginia that gave the lead in the memorable American solution of 1776, the model for our Sixth Article and First Amendment on religious tests and established churches. Although there was this difference, that we were a multi-religious people while they were mono-religious, the problem stood equal in both cases. Had the Parsons' Cause triumphed and its principle persisted in the later history of our country, few will deny that the federal government would lack the support of a united citizenry.

<sup>26</sup> Decorme, I, 302.

<sup>27</sup> Medina Ascensio, 173-174.

<sup>28</sup> Medina Ascensio, 174, states this directly. Vázquez himself took up his mission to obtain the Patronato with sincerity. The author cited says: "It would be a serious error, and an injustice, to accuse the Mexican clergy of hostility to the Patronato as such. With a sense of right, and yet serenely, the bishops and ecclesiastical cabildos tried to have the Holy See bestow the concession of this privilege."

Arnold Toynbee has a canny remark in his treatment of post-Reformation governments, especially that of Louis XIV and the brief effort of the Puritans.<sup>29</sup> Louis, one recalls, put his land into a religious straight-jacket, with Gallican rivots, and the result was a nation of sceptics and revolutionaries. A wise ruler, Toynbee says, will reverse the vicious principle of *Cujus Regio Ejus Religio* and make it read *Religio Regionis Religio Regis*.

Mexico began its republican history by adopting the second of these principles. But for reasons already indicated, the trend was reversed when the Yorkinos intruded into politics. They had their way. The settlement whereby government ruled religion was enacted into constitutional law in 1856 by those whom Bancroft calls "the advanced party" or "the socialists."<sup>30</sup> In their decree of new rules for society, they rearranged the surface and ignored the basic social organization.

The nub of the matter is rarely described. There were basic defects in religious practice in the Mexico of 1831, and its reform constituted an imperative. Vásquez was commissioned by Gregory XVI to visit and correct irregularities in the houses of religious orders.<sup>31</sup> He found things in so desperate a condition that he actually suggested to the Pope the suppression of many houses. To counter the investigation and renovation, some seventy of those men under suspicion joined the York Lodges to influence government and block the move, and they raised a fair sum of money to obtain the immunity. Other clerics abandoned their calling so completely as to devote the rest of their lives to the destruction of what they had forsaken. In this situation the reform affair, which should have been a purely internal religious matter, was carried into the public forum. Two highly charged contrary forces, the Catholic and what came to be called the anticlerical, stood in violent opposition. The latter, on the defensive, were far more vocal and successful in getting the ear—and the arm—of the Congress. They despoiled the endowments established for welfare work of all kinds, on the score that these were riches of the Church. They ended freedom of education so that private right ceased to have standing in court. The fathers of this suppressive movement were former

<sup>29</sup> Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History* (Somervell abridgment), New York, 1947, 494. On page 483 he writes: "This theory [that rulers impose religion—or even superstition—successfully] is about as remote from the truth as the social contract theory of the origin of states."

<sup>30</sup> Walter V. Scholes, "Church and State at the Mexican Constitutional Convention, 1856-1857," in *The Americas*, IV (October 1947), 151-174. See Bancroft, V, 683, and *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> Decorme, I, 310-311.



clerics, in Europe Gregoire and DuPradt, in Mexico Mier, Mora, Alpulche.<sup>32</sup> This is the inner story of the religious struggle about which so much heat is generated and so little worthwhile history written.

Vásquez, then, undertook the double duty of improving religious conditions and of protecting the Church before successive congressional movements. He wrote and spoke with distinction, yet always moderately as became the scholar and gentleman.<sup>33</sup> His appeal was to sanity, to the actual mores of the populace, their traditions and rooted economy of life, and especially to respect for rights wherever they existed. This brought him into controversy with "the advanced party" as early as 1833, when the wily Santa Anna—who if he had any definite political position at all wanted to revive the Patronato—slipped out of the light long enough for his vice-president, Valentin Gómez Farias, to decree certain alterations in ecclesiastical life, such as the termination of the missions in California. Public revulsion at his conduct led to counter-action and tacit revocation of his decrees by the now returned Santa Anna.

In 1836 government attempted to bypass Vásquez and cajole the Pope into granting Mexico the full Patronato.<sup>34</sup> Vásquez met this challenge. In a comprehensive letter to Gregory XVI, he sketched the background of the maneuver in terms that indicate the quality of his character.<sup>35</sup> He was a thoroughbred. He disclosed that government had long acted as though in possession of the coveted power, by directing appointments to clerical posts, altering or confiscating funds, regulation of religious orders, disbarment of religious teachers. The move did not succeed. After eight years of futile negotiation Baranda, the Minister of External Affairs, declared in 1844: "The Pope wants independence, and the government demands the Patronato. This status is not permanent."<sup>36</sup> It is never permanent, when the State wants to direct the affairs of religion.

A wise government would have seen the issue as one of fact rather than of doctrine. That headstrong group could not understand how a ruler might remain sovereign while permitting freedom to voluntary associations made up of nearly one hundred per centum of the people. The same kind of haziness occurred on a

<sup>32</sup> Shiels, "Church and State in the First Decade of Mexican Independence," *loc. cit.*, 210.

<sup>33</sup> A splendid example is seen in his 1836 letter of Vásquez to the Holy See cited in Decorme, I, 351-352.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 351, Vásquez states: "not to us, nor to any of the bishops, was this matter submitted."

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 351-352.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 352.

point contested later in the convention of 1856, in regard to public recognition of religious vows.<sup>37</sup> Of old a religious could not spontaneously abdicate his vows any more than a husband could abandon his wife, and both defections were prosecuted. Quite different was the case of one who obtained proper release from his vows. The "advanced party" considered life under vows as "involuntary servitude," for the record. Scholes says that their argument appeared to be for the most part a demand for the extinction of religious orders as an institution in Mexico.

These are but instances of the running attack against the normal functioning of religion in the Mexico of those days. On the other hand there were not wanting reactionary extremists, such as those delegates of 1856 who argued that to omit from the law a public sanction for vows would open the gates and cause a wholesale egress of monks. This confuses shadow and substance. For the most part the debate proceeded on rough grounds, with dictatorships, minority government, chicanery among politicians, dodging of responsibility, the lure of loot, and all the baser causes of civil uprisings.

Vásquez and the revived hierarchy worked hard to restore the religious motivation of their people. To some extent they succeeded. They did not succeed in leading the constitution-makers to design a public law that was built upon the religion of the common man. Perhaps Mexican society was then in too deep a state of chaos for such an achievement. Nor did they bring Congress to see the real risks of a Patronato, that control of State over Church which can work only in an ideal world. The political forces of Mexico, largely unresponsive to the popular will, increasingly proved by their deeds how correct was the stand of Vásquez in this struggle. He died, afflicted by the sad state of his fatherland, on October 7, 1847.<sup>38</sup> Civil, religious and foreign war engulfed the country. If one knows why he lost the battle, the whole political history of Mexico takes on a new light. His merit seems to lie in this, that his persistent policy had its results in strengthening the ordinary citizen to stand up under a calamitous series of conflicts, and to emerge in our day more fit to carry on an independent, self-directed public life.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Xavier University, Cincinnati

<sup>37</sup> See Scholes, 161-162. On these debates, he remarks: "Thus the convention once again upheld the power of the state over the church." Cf. Decorme, I, 315.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 435.

# *The First Establishment of the Faith In New France*

## Chapters XXI to XXV

A few years ago a writer, commenting on my *Frontenac and the Jesuits*, objected that in spite of my criticisms of Le Clercq, Hennepin and Le Tac, I appealed to their testimony.<sup>1</sup> Of course I appealed to the testimony of these writers, because I do not believe in that crude historical criticism, according to which documents are divided into good and bad documents, and thereafter a good document is accepted *in toto*, while a bad one is wholly rejected—as though there could be no true statements in a bad document, and as though when one has established the truth of some particular statement, one must reject it because it is found in the midst of patently false assertions. As instances of my appeal, he gives first Le Clercq's *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*, which I never criticized as unreliable, but quite the opposite. His second reference is to Hennepin's *New Discovery*, whose testimony I accepted in this case because it is supported by independent evidence, and I made it a point to say that this was my reason for accepting it. His third instance, I did not find, for the reference is to a page of the bibliography where there is not a word about any of the three people whom he mentions.

Elsewhere, the same writer says that Father Le Clercq knows that the first law of history is seeking the truth, as the preface of the *First Establishment* makes plain: "As truth is the soul and proper essence of history, this has no need of being supported and authorized by aught else." I had said that "it would be difficult to find in historical literature works teeming with more fabrications than"<sup>2</sup> the works of Le Clercq, Hennepin and Le Tac. On this he remarks: "Such a sweeping statement cannot be taken as a serious criticism."<sup>3</sup>

By way of suggesting how this "sweeping statement" could be supported by detailed evidence, I propose in the present article to

<sup>1</sup> "Ce qui n'empêchera pas le P. Delanglez d'en appeler au témoignage de ces écrivains pour étayer ses thèses." A. Godbout in *Culture*, 2 (1941): 103.

<sup>2</sup> *Frontenac and the Jesuits*, Chicago, 1939, 260.

<sup>3</sup> A. Godbout, *Centenaire de l'Histoire du Canada de François-Xavier Garneau*, Montreal, 1945, 282.

examine chapters 21 to 25 of the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, and to show that neither Father Zénobe Membré nor Father Anastasius Douay are the authors of what is paraded under their names in this work. Everything attributed to Father Membré in these chapters is actually taken from the relation officielle; and what is said to be the relation of Father Douay is simply some vague recollections about the voyage, plus a few items taken from the "relation made by N. on the memoirs of M. Cavellier, brother of M. de la Salle, who accompanied him on this voyage." The main point of what follows is not to question the veracity or the personal integrity of Le Clercq himself, but to show that the *Premier Etablissement* which bears his name has been tampered with, and is so full of "fabrications" and anomalies that Le Clercq's authorship of the work as *published* is extremely doubtful.

Ganong, the editor and translator of the *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*, wrote as follows:

Moreover, as is well known, the *Premier Etablissement* does not contain mention of certain matters, viz. an account of the Gaspesian mission after 1681, which are said in the *Nouvelle Relation* to be there. All of the facts taken together, including the point as to the proof-reading mentioned in a preceding page,<sup>4</sup> appear to be in harmony with the probability that Father Le Clercq prepared himself the manuscript of both books, but that he entrusted the *Premier Etablissement* to some other who, omitting a part of our author's material in order to make room for his own, inserted such matter as he wished in condemnation of the Jesuits, who are mentioned only with respect in the *Nouvelle Relation*.<sup>5</sup>

Precisely what Le Clercq did and what his motives were, are matters of conjecture, but it is certainly strange to find in two books published at the same time such a difference in tone. The privilege, the registration and the "achevé d'imprimer" of the *Nouvelle Relation* and of the first volume of the *Premier Etablissement* are all given the same date. At the end of this first volume, in the last chapter of the book, there is a vicious attack against the *Jesuit Relations*, clearly indicating that someone else had a hand in the making of the book, for, as Ganong just said, the Jesuits are mentioned only with respect in the *Nouvelle Relation*.

The printing of the second volume is said to have been completed on July 26, 1691. Since both books were written at the same time, why should there be an interval of three months between the publication of the first and second volume of the *Premier Etablissement*?

<sup>4</sup> W. F. Ganong, transl. and ed., *New Relation of Gapesia*, Toronto, 191, 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

ment? Perhaps the author of the second volume needed some time to write the adventures of La Salle, and also the Monseignat relation had not yet reached Paris. In 1684, there had been some thought of writing a book on La Salle,<sup>6</sup> but Hennepin had forestalled it by palming off as his own Bernou's *Relation des découvertes*. Again, what is the purpose of including in the *Establishment of the Faith in New France* such irrelevant materials as the letters patent authorizing La Salle to discover the western sea?

In his *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*, speaking of the church of St. Peter at Percé Island, Le Clercq says that he will treat at length of the dedication of this church "in the book I wrote on the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, which is sold at the same bookseller."<sup>7</sup> Yet, notes Ganong, "there is unfortunately no reference to this matter in that book." At the end of the *Nouvelle Relation*, he says: "I am omitting here the circumstances of this second mission [Percée in 1681] of which I shall speak in the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*."<sup>8</sup> Again, as said before, there is no mention of this mission in the book.

This leads to a further inquiry. When Le Clercq saw the book in print, he must have noticed these omissions. Did he protest? We do not know. Those who wrote the *First Establishment* may well have told him that they had the accounts of Father Membré and of Father Douay; but there are contradictions which cannot be reconciled with what we know of Le Clercq's career as a missionary. For instance, he is made to say that Father Exupère was missionary at Percée from 1673 to 1683. This Father as well as Father Hilarion Guesnin were there until 1675, when Le Clercq himself succeeded them. "It is then scarcely possible that he should have ascribed his own labors from 1675 to 1683 to another person."<sup>9</sup>

We shall now examine the five chapters in question, and specifically chapters 22 and 23 which purport to contain Membré's relation, as well as chapter 25, which is supposedly Douay's account of the last two voyages of La Salle, and the trek across the continent after the latter's death.

Chapter 21 begins with various missions in New France, but the author soon passes to something more congenial: "I shall hereafter

<sup>6</sup> Bernou to Renaudot, February 1, 1684, BN, Mss. fr., n. a., 7497: 89.

<sup>7</sup> C. Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*, Paris, 1691, 20.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 572.

<sup>9</sup> J. G. Shea, transl. and ed., *First Establishment of the Faith in New France by Father Christian Le Clercq*, 2 vols., New York, 1881, 2: 80, note.—All the references in this article are to Shea's translation.



limit myself to laying before the public the great discoveries made by order of the king, under the command of M. de Frontenac and the direction of M. de la Salle, as being those which promised the greatest fruit for the establishment of the faith, if in the course of time they are resumed and supported as they deserve." He then goes on to say that in 1677, La Salle believed that great progress could be made by ascertaining whether or not the Mississippi emptied into the Vermilion Sea. In 1677, La Salle knew full well that the Mississippi emptied into the Gulf of Mexico and not into the Vermilion Sea, for he had seen the map of Jolliet as well as his relation.

There follows the building of the *Griffon*, its sailing to Michilimackinac, the journey to the Miami, thence to Pimiteoui. Here they built Fort Crèvecoeur and Hennepin left for the Upper Mississippi. "I have hitherto given only a short abridgment of the Relation which Father Membré gives us of these first commencements of this enterprise." All that is found in this chapter is an abridgment of Hennepin's *Description of Louisiana*, which in turn is a plagiarism of Bernou's *Relation des découvertes*.

The next chapter, the twenty-second, begins as follows:

As I continue the account of a discovery in which Father Zénobe took a considerable part and was constantly present, and as we derive from his letters the chief information we can have about it, I think I shall please the reader better by giving here in his own words what that Father left in form of an abridged Relation, from which I retrench merely a number of adventures and remarks which are not essential.

This good Father, who has been left with Father Maxime in Louisiana, will one day, if God spares his life, give it more in detail . . . I produce what he says here all the more confidently, as it corresponds with many fragments which we have of Sieur de la Salle's letters and the testimony of Frenchmen and Indians who accompanied them, and who witnessed the discovery.

The following is, then, word for word what that good Religious has written about it.

Of course it may be said that Father Membré, as one of the members of the expedition, experienced all that is narrated, but between experiencing and writing the account put under his name there is a vast difference. As for the testimony of the Indians who were with La Salle, one wonders how Le Clercq, or whoever wrote this chapter, obtained it. On his own admission he did not know Algonquian,<sup>10</sup> and consequently could not have questioned the Indians. But, one may say, he could have got it indirectly either from

<sup>10</sup> *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*, 29.

an interpreter or from some Frenchman who knew the language. There is no evidence, however, that Indians or Frenchmen who were with La Salle communicated with Le Clercq between 1682 and 1687, when the latter went back to France. And even so, this would not support the above conjecture, for he himself says that he copied the relation in Quebec "a few years later," and we know that he did not go to Quebec after 1680, two years before the journey to the sea.

In the enumeration of the tribes of the Northwest, we are told that the Maskoutens and the Outagamys dwell on the bank of a river called Melleoki, while the Kikapous and the Ainoves "form two villages west of these last up the river Checagoumémant." This is rather peculiar, for the Mascoutens and the Foxes lived well inland, far from the Milwaukee River, and the Kickapoo and Iowa certainly did not live on the Checagoumémant, which is the name given to Chicago by La Salle.<sup>11</sup>

The account of the attack made by the Iroquois on La Salle's party includes the following details, supposedly "word for word" from Membre's relation. According to this, Membre was beside Tonti when the soldier was stabbed, while the latter wrote: "On my way [to the Illinois] I met Fathers de la Ribourde and Zénobe Membre, who were coming to look after me."<sup>12</sup> And La Salle, who had the story from Tonti, says: "One league from the village, he [Tonti] met Father Zénobe Membre who . . . ran to the spot where the fighting was taking place to help him in all that depended on his ministry."<sup>13</sup> That Membre was deputed to the Iroquois, that he found out they were hungry, and that the Illinois gave them food, is found nowhere in Tonti, either in the first or in the second relation, nor for that matter is it found in the letter of La Salle. Yet it would seem that such a change in the attitude of the Indians would have been mentioned by La Salle or Tonti.

According to the *Premier Etablissement*, Membre is made to say: "I went to look for the Father [de la Ribourde], seeing that he did not return . . . The next morning at daybreak we returned to

<sup>11</sup> In his letter of post September 29, 1680, La Salle wrote: "Il en faut un [établissement] au fond du lac des Illinois, ou la navigation finit au lieu mesme nommé Checagoumémant." Margry (2: 82) has Checagou.

<sup>12</sup> L. P. Kellogg, ed., *Early Narratives of the Northwest 1634-1699*, New York, 1917, 292. In his memoir of 1684, Tonti had written: "Je trouvay en chemin le R. P. Zénobe, lequel venait me chercher, espérant trouver en moy quelque sentiment de vie et me donner toutes les assistances spirituelles." Margry, 1: 587.

<sup>13</sup> La Salle's letter of the autumn, 1681, Margry, 2: 123.

the same side where we were the day before, making all possible search." Tonti, however, has a different story: he and one of his men went to look for the missionary; and when he reported his vain search to Father Membré, the latter was "greatly grieved."<sup>14</sup> As for Membré making shoes for himself and his companions, it is quite clear that each one made his own, for Tonti rebuked one of his men because he delayed finishing them.<sup>15</sup>

The adventures of La Salle are told next. Why the Canadians should be blamed for the wreck of the *Griffon*, of the *Saint-Pierre*, and for the loss of La Salle's canoes in the rapids between Montreal and Fort Frontenac is not quite clear. Or rather, it is evident that whoever wrote this "word for word" account, echoed what La Salle had said and blamed the Canadians for every untoward accident that befell him. "As I remark nothing of importance in the new preparations that had to be made for this second enterprise, nor in the voyage from Michilimackinac to Fort Frontenac, and from Fort Frontenac to the Miami, I shall here omit what Father Zénobe says concerning it in his Relation so as not to occupy the reader uselessly." The author then tells us that La Salle on his way to the Miami, went by Niagara Falls, and that a canoe was carried away by the current; but, he adds, "the men and the goods were saved." We know, however, that La Salle went to the Miami by way of Lake Simcoe, thus avoiding the falls.<sup>16</sup>

"At this place we now proceed to resume word for word what is most essential in the continuation of Father Zénobe, which seems even to be drawn from the memoirs of Sieur de la Salle who accompanied him." In another article, I have shown that most of what is in Le Clercq is nothing else than the so-called relation officielle of La Salle's voyage to the sea.<sup>17</sup> This relation officielle was made in Paris sometime in 1683, that is, after the letters of Father Membré, June 3, 1682, and of Tonti, July 23, 1682, arrived there. I have also shown that 20% of this relation officielle was taken from the first letter, 60% from the second, and 20% from neither. It should be quite clear that since Father Membré did not write the relation officielle, he cannot have written what is in Le Clercq. We shall now proceed with the "word for word" account of Membré.

"On December 21, I embarked with Sieur de Tonti and a part

<sup>14</sup> Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, 294. Cf. the version in Margry, 1: 588 f.

<sup>15</sup> Margry, 1: 591.

<sup>16</sup> La Salle's letter of the autumn, 1681, Margry, 2: 185.

<sup>17</sup> "La Salle's Expedition of 1682," *MID-AMERICA*, 22 (1940): 18 ff.

of our people on Lake Dauphin [Illinois] to go toward the Rivière Divine, called Checagou by the Indians." The "Rivière Divine" was the Des Plaines-Illinois river, and was not called Checagou. The Chicago River was quite distinct from the other two, as the author shows in the next paragraph: "there is a portage to be made to enter the Illinois River"; that is to say, they entered the Chicago River and portaged to the Rivière Divine. They descended the Illinois River to "where Fort Crèvecoeur stands. We found it in good condition; Sieur de la Salle left his orders there." Fort Crèvecoeur had long since been abandoned. The relation officielle simply says that Fort Crèvecoeur *stood* there.<sup>18</sup> What orders La Salle left at Fort Crèvecoeur is not said. The Indians of the great Illinois village cannot have spent the winter on Lake Pimiteoui, for if these Indians had been there, they could not have failed seeing the French. The relation officielle simply says: "the Indians spent the winter elsewhere." Every time some new detail is added, we can be quite sure that the author will get himself involved in some contradiction.

They departed from the mouth of the Illinois on February 13, and six leagues below this point they found the River of the Osages, *i.e.*, the Missouri. Here Le Clercq has a digression on the Sea of the West,<sup>19</sup> and afterwards comes back to the muddy waters of the Missouri. This last detail is found not in Membré, but in one of La Salle's letters.<sup>20</sup> On arriving at the Arkansas, they were invited to the village, but, according to the relation officielle, "not deeming it advisable to allow his men to scatter, Sieur de la Salle told them that his men were unwilling to be separate from one another."<sup>21</sup> This is omitted in Le Clercq; according to his account, the most important chief asked them to go to the village "to which we readily consented."

At this point the relation officielle has the following: "The Ohio River, which has its sources in the Iroquois country, empties into the Mississippi opposite this village." At this date, 1683, Tonti had not yet identified the Wabash with the Ohio, and there is no evidence that Membré ever did. On the map which accompanies the *First Establishment*, the Ohio is marked as a tributary of the Wabash. This came from a better knowledge of the waterways of the Mississippi Valley when Le Clercq's book was compiled; but

<sup>18</sup> "Où estoit scitué le fort de Crèvecoeur," *loc. cit.*, 28.

<sup>19</sup> "A Mirage: the Sea of the West," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique française*, 1 (1947): 366 ff.

<sup>20</sup> La Salle's letter of post March, 1683, Margry, 2: 180.

<sup>21</sup> MID-AMERICA, 22 (1940): 30.

in the first months of 1683, the people who wrote the relation officielle were puzzled by what they read in the letters of La Salle. Moreover, there was then in Paris a map made by M. de Belmont, who seems to have thought that the Ohio really emptied into the Mississippi at the Arkansas,<sup>22</sup> and all the maps and globes made by Coronelli, which were based on the relation officielle, show the Ohio emptying at this place.

When the time came to take possession of Louisiana, we are told, "you can talk much to Indians by signs, and those with us managed to make themselves a little understood in their language. I took occasion to explain something of the truth of a God and the mysteries of our redemption, of which they saw the insignia." Considering that the Quapaw were of Siouan stock, and spoke a language which none of the party understood, this sermon seems to have been in vain. At the Taensa: "I made them understand all I wished about our mysteries." Even if the interpreters knew a little Illinois, the Taensa language belonged to a subdivision of the Muskogean group, and he could scarcely have made them understand "all he wished." Next he mentions the thirty-four and forty villages, "the names of all of which were given us." These figures are taken from Tonti,<sup>23</sup> but neither he nor Membre gives the names of the villages.

From here on, there is little in the relation officielle which is taken from Membre's letter. Most of what follows is taken from Tonti's interlarded with bits of Bernou's. Among the Natchez, "Sieur de la Salle, whose very air, engaging manners, and skillful mind, command alike love and respect, so impressed the heart of these tribes that they did not know how to treat us well enough." Here too, La Salle is supposed to have possession of the country, although there is nothing about this in the other sources. They left the Natchez on "Easter Sunday, March 29, after having celebrated the divine mysteries with the French and fulfilled the duties of good Christians. For our Indians, though the most advanced and best instructed, were not yet capable." There is nothing about this in the relation officielle, and Membre in his letter does not even mention the Natchez. On the other hand, Membre's letter speaks of the Huma,<sup>24</sup> but since there is nothing about this tribe in the relation officielle, it is not mentioned in the *First Establishment*.

We now come to a very puzzling passage. After leaving the

<sup>22</sup> Tronson to Belmont, July 2, 1682, in Margry, 2: 276.

<sup>23</sup> Tonti's letter of July 22, 1682, in Habig, 200.

<sup>24</sup> Margry, 2: 210. Cf. also Margry, 1: 604.



Koroa, Tonti says: "We missed ten nations, having taken one channel for another; this channel forms an island about 40 leagues long."<sup>25</sup> In the relation of 1684, at the Arkansas, he says, "we took the right of the river, and so missed the Chickasaw, because of an island which is nearly eighty leagues long,"<sup>26</sup> and farther down, that there is "a channel leading to the sea which is fifty leagues away." It may be that they took the west branch of the Mississippi, that is, what is today the lower course of the Arkansas River; this seems to be confirmed by the map of Franquelin of 1684. This is Big Island, but this island is not eighty, nor even forty leagues long. The author of the *First Establishment*, however, did not know this detail, and he proceeded to embroider on the relation officielle:

About six leagues below [the Natchez] the river divides itself into two arms or channels, forming a great island, which must be more than sixty leagues long. We followed the channel on the right, although we had intended to take the other, but passed it in a great fog without seeing it. We had a guide with us, who pointed it out by signs; but the canoe in which he was being behind, those who steered it neglected what this Indian told them and endeavored to overtake us, for we were considerably ahead. We were assured that, in that other channel, ten different nations are encountered, which are all numerous and very good people.

It was all very well for Tonti to make a mistake, but Le Clercq published it and so drew upon himself the wrath of Iberville. Both in the letter which he wrote to the minister from La Rochelle, and in the log of the *Badine*, he took the Recollect to task. "He speaks of many things which are false, according to the journal of sieur Joutel, which you had the honor of giving me."<sup>27</sup> And elsewhere: "I cannot believe that he was so unfortunate as to dare to hoodwink the whole of France, although I knew well that he had lied in many parts of his relation, considering what he wrote about Canada and Hudson Bay, where he lied impudently."<sup>28</sup> Later Iberville compares the distance from the Arkansas to the sea and finds a difference of seventy three leagues and a half:<sup>29</sup> "He is a liar who has disguised everything."<sup>30</sup> Le Clercq, however, is not to blame, but the man or men who edited his work; and in 1699, Iberville could not know that Membré did not write the account credited to him. It is useless to say that all the members of the expedition

<sup>25</sup> Tonti's letter of July 22, 1682, Habig, 221.

<sup>26</sup> Margry, 1: 603, 600.

<sup>27</sup> Iberville to the minister, July 29, 1699, Margry, 4: 120.

<sup>28</sup> Journal of the *Badine*, *ibid.*, 168.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

were deceived or that they were misinformed by one of their Indian guides. From the Koroa on, they had no guides, and even if they had had one, it is certainly strange that Membré who understood all he wished at the Taensa, suddenly had to talk by signs and forgot his gift of tongues.

Until it comes to describe the return of the expedition, the *Premier Etablissement* follows quite closely the relation officielle. With regard to the episode of eating human flesh, Nicolas de la Salle says:

The day after, having made four leagues, we found a canoe with three Indians who crossed over to the right bank. The men fled, and we found in the canoe smoked meat of a crocodile and another piece of meat. We ate it all, and afterwards recognized from the bones, that it was the side of a man. The meat is much better than that of the crocodile. We left an awl in the canoe as payment.<sup>31</sup>

It would have been impolitic to say that they had eaten it all, so Le Clercq wrote: "Soon after, it was remarked that it was human flesh, so we left the rest to our Indians. It was very good and delicate."

At the end of the account of the attack on the Quinipissa, Le Clercq says: "Our people wished to go and burn the village of these traitors, but Sieur de la Salle prudently wished only to make himself formidable to this nation without exasperating it, in order to manage their minds in time of need." Tonti gives us quite a different story: it was La Salle who wished to chastize the Quinipissa, and he only desisted when he found out that he had not enough ammunition.<sup>32</sup> "He [Tonti] had left Sieur Dautray and Sieur Cochois among the Miami, and other people among the Illinois, with two hundred new cabins of Indians, who were going to re-people that nation." Tonti himself says that on his way up the Mississippi, he met a band of Tamaroa, Kaskaskias and Missouri, who asked him whether he had seen a canoe with four Iroquois. "But when we told them that it was far away, they turned back and returned with us to their village, where there are about 200 cabins."<sup>33</sup>

From this point until the end of chapter 24, we have a description of the country. We must observe, however, that the author

<sup>31</sup> This passage is not in Margry, but in a manuscript of the relation, in the third of four similarly bound volumes bearing the following inscription on the front cover: "A la Substitution du Valdec proche Soleure en Suisse" (E. E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago), 250 f.

<sup>32</sup> Margry, 1: 608.

<sup>33</sup> Tonti's letter of July 22, 1682, Habig, 228.

speaks in general, and takes at random whatever information is found in Membré, La Salle and Jolliet. For instance, who had assured him that beyond the flood line of the Mississippi, there are "vast fields of excellent land skirted in spots by very charming hills, lofty woods, groves through which one might ride on horseback, so clear and unobstructed are the paths"? Who told him that "there are beaver, otters, martens, wild-cats, till a hundred leagues below the Tamarois, especially on the Missouri, on the Wabash, on the Chepousse, which is opposite it, and on all the smaller rivers in this space"? To know all this, he must have gone up the Missouri, up the Wabash, up the Chepousse, whereas it is certain that no one had gone up these rivers at this time, and no Indian had mentioned them.

The descriptions of the Michybichy and of the opossum are taken from one of La Salle's letters,<sup>34</sup> and that of the buffalo is in the *Jesuit Relations*.<sup>35</sup> "The Indians assured us that inland, toward the west, there are animals on which men ride, and which carry heavy loads; they described them as horses, and showed us two feet which are actually hoofs of horses." La Salle<sup>36</sup> and Tonti<sup>37</sup> speak of horses, and Jolliet described "those animals used by western Indians, on which they ride as we do horses."<sup>38</sup> The next passage is also from Jolliet: "The cottonwood trees are large; of these the Indians dig out canoes forty or fifty feet long, and have sometimes fleets of a hundred and fifty at the foot of the village." This is found on Jolliet's map and in the letter of Dablon of August 1, 1674.<sup>39</sup>

The extent of the prairies is also taken from Jolliet as well as the "grenadiers." Speaking of some fruit, La Salle wrote: "It is perhaps what Jolliet called 'grenades,' although they are nowhere to be found."<sup>40</sup> The *First Establishment*: "Winter is little known except by the rains." Jolliet: "Winter is only known by the rains." Le Clercq: "They raise three or four crops of corn a year." Jolliet: "Most of them reap corn three times a year."<sup>41</sup> Finally, "no one would dare to pass between the chief and the cane-torch which

<sup>34</sup> La Salle's letter of post March, 1683, Margry, 2: 182 f.

<sup>35</sup> JR, 45: 194 f.

<sup>36</sup> La Salle's letter of post March, 1683, Margry, 2: 202.

<sup>37</sup> Margry, 1: 595.

<sup>38</sup> "The 1674 Account of the Discovery of the Mississippi," MID-AMERICA, 26 (1944): 324. Cf. also "The Jolliet Lost Map of the Mississippi," 28 (1946): 106 ff.

<sup>39</sup> "The 1674 Account," loc. cit., 318.

<sup>40</sup> La Salle's letter of post March, 1683, Margry, 2: 178.

<sup>41</sup> "The 1674 Account," loc. cit., 319.

burns in his cabin, and is carried before him when he goes out; all make a circuit around it with some ceremony." Membre has: "One does not pass between them and the torch which burns in their house."<sup>42</sup>

They do not know fire-arms, but only use stone-knives and hatchets, "this is quite contrary to what had been told us, where we were assured that by trade with the Spaniards, who were only twenty-five or thirty leagues off, they had axes, guns and all commodities which are found in Europe." The author of all this had not been told anything of the kind, but had read on Jolliet's map the following inscription: "I have seen a village which was only five days' journey from a nation which trades with California; if I had arrived two days earlier, I could have talked with those who had brought four hatchets as presents."<sup>43</sup> The guns are mentioned in Thévenot's account<sup>44</sup> and there is on the Manitoumie map an inscription to that effect.<sup>45</sup> They had, however, found nations who had bracelets of real pearl, "but they pierce them by fire and thus spoil them." In Tonti's relation of 1684, we read that an Indian "made me a present of these pearls, which are spoiled, because they pierce them with a hot iron."<sup>46</sup>

After mentioning that he did his best to teach the "principal truths of Christianity to the nations which I met," the author of all this continues: "The Illinois language served me a little about a hundred leagues further on the [Mississippi] river, and I made the rest understood by gestures and some terms in their dialect which I insensibly picked up." Until they reached the Quapaw, they did not meet anybody down the river; and the Quapaw were 600 miles down from the mouth of the Illinois River.

Some kind of explanation had to be given as to where the manuscript, which Membre supposedly wrote, was found. We are told that:

I here give my readers all that is important in the relation which Father Zénobe addressed to Father Valentine, superior of the missions at Quebec, and which I copied on the spot some years after. This missionary did not at the time expect to go to France that same year, 1682, but Sieur de la Salle, having suddenly taken his resolutions, asked him [Membre] to consent to make the voyage [to France], until he could proceed thither in person, next year.

<sup>42</sup> Membre's letter of June 3, 1682, Margry, 2: 209.

<sup>43</sup> "The Discovery of the Mississippi. Primary Sources," MID-AMERICA, 27 (1945): 228.

<sup>44</sup> *Voyages de Mr Thevenot*, Paris, 1681, 34.

<sup>45</sup> "The Jolliet Lost Map," MID-AMERICA, 28 (1946): 111 f.

<sup>46</sup> Margry, 1: 601.

This passage will not stand examination. First, Membre did not send anything except his letter of June 3, 1682; second, if Membre arrived in Quebec on the eve of the departure of the ships for France, he had no time to write any account of his travels; third, Le Clercq could not have copied this account in Quebec "some years later," for we know that he did not go there after 1679 or 1680.

What is found in Le Clercq is simply the relation officielle which was written in Paris in 1683. The document is now among Bernou's papers and among those of Renaudot's, and was utilized to write the *First Establishment of the Faith*. To it were added a few pages about the country taken from what was known about Louisiana at the time. We can disregard altogether the theory that Membre wrote both the relation officielle and what we read in Le Clercq, for there is no evidence that his achievements are in any way comparable with those of Bernou, the real author of the relation officielle. Once the latter was written, it was an easy matter to add a few pages from the literature on the subject.

"It was thus that M. de la Salle, whom we may justly call the Columbus of his age . . ." All of this is nothing else than the last paragraph of the relation officielle, with the "Columbus of his age" thrown in for good measure.<sup>47</sup> "His first design had been to find the passage to the South Sea [Pacific Ocean], which had been sought for so long a time; and although the river Colbert did not lead to it, yet this great man had so much talent and resolution that he hoped to find it, if it were possible, as he would have succeeded in doing had God spared his life." We have explained elsewhere that after the fiasco of 1669, La Salle never again tried to find a route to the Sea of the South;<sup>48</sup> all that he wanted was to found a few posts on the Mississippi and also to find the Chucagua of Garcilasco de la Vega.

The return of La Salle to France, the selection of spiritual laborers, the choosing of the soldiers and lay people who were to accompany the expedition are then briefly narrated. "All being ready, they set sail on July 24, 1684. A storm which came on a few days later obliged them to put in at Chef-de-Bois to repair one of their masts, broken by the gale." In his journal, Cavelier had written that there was only a "very moderate wind";<sup>49</sup> Joutel wrote that "the weather was not heavy,"<sup>50</sup> and elsewhere that the "weather was slightly

<sup>47</sup> Cf. "La Salle Expedition of 1682," *MID-AMERICA*, 22 (1940): 35.

<sup>48</sup> "A Mirage: the Sea of the West," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique française*, 1 (1947): 374 f.

<sup>49</sup> Margry, 2: 501.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 92.



heavy."<sup>51</sup> If the breaking of the bowsprit of the *Joly* had been due to a storm, there was no reason for suspecting foul play.

On the way to Florida, the squadron reached the Isle aux Pins, "anchoring there a day to take in water." Joutel, however, wrote as follows:

On December 3, we sighted the Isle aux Pins which is a small island near that of Cuba, where we cast anchor in a cove. We found various kinds of refreshments and pigs, the Spaniards having left some there which have now multiplied. I did not notice that we took in water in this island, as asserted by the author of a book printed since our return. It is the *Nouvel [Premier] Etablissement de la Foy dans la Nouvelle France*, in which the author claims that he took what he says from the memoirs of Father Anastasius who was with us. This would be difficult to prove, considering that the said Father has not written anything, at least on his way up with us. There are several falsehoods in this book, and I do not believe that Father Anastasius told them, for I have always recognized in him a very honest man and a good religious incapable of telling a falsehood. But as there are may be some exaggerations, I address myself to the author of the book.<sup>52</sup>

In the same paragraph, there is another correction. After anchoring at San Antonio, on the Island of Cuba, Le Clercq continued: "The beauty and allurements of the spot and its advantageous position induced them to stay and even to land. For some unknown reason the Spaniards had abandoned there several kinds of provisions, and among the rest some Spanish wine which they took." This is also repeated in the pseudo-Tonti;<sup>53</sup> Joutel noted in his journal:

We filled a few barrels with water. Those who had been on land said that they had found one bottle in which there was some liquor or wine left. This is what caused the author of the *Etablissement of the Faith* to say that they had found a quantity of refreshments, and that the Spaniards must have left them there. As though it could not have been left by some filibuster or other. But those who write on other people's reports are subject to be imposed upon and to make false relations.<sup>54</sup>

Without our knowledge of the geography of the Gulf, the next two paragraphs hardly make any sense. For instance, how did they know that they were forty or fifty leagues from the mouth of the river? They were exactly at the latitude mentioned by La Salle,

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 492.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 110, note. This note is taken from Delisle's copy.

<sup>53</sup> "Il ne fut trouvé au dit lieu que une bouteille ou flacon de verre renforcé ou la liqueur qui étoit dedans étoit corompue."—Remarques tirées du livre intitulé les dernières decouvertes dans la merique septentrionnelle Mis au jour par Monsieur le chevalier de tonty..., Archives du Service Hydrographique (ASH), 115-9: no. 12.

<sup>54</sup> Joutel in Delisle's résumé, ASH, 115-9: no. 11. Cf. Margry, 3: 113.

namely, between 27° and 28°. <sup>55</sup> What does the next line mean: "the more so as the river, before entering the Gulf, coasts along the shore of the Gulf to the west"? If so, they should have met the mouth of the river where La Salle claimed it was; as a matter of fact the Mississippi flowed toward the southeast. How did the author of this faciful geography know that they had "passed Espiritu Santo Bay without recognizing it"? Neither La Salle nor anybody else for that matter had any idea as to the location of this bay. <sup>56</sup>

At this place it is well to notice that the *Dernieres decouvertes* by the pseudo-Tonti speaks of various landmarks, which are also mentioned in the *Premier Etablissement de la Foy*. Le Clercq, or whoever wrote this, says that "the three vessels, at last in the middle of February, met at Espiritu Santo Bay, where there was an almost continual roadstead." Joutel drily remarks: "We did not even see this bay," <sup>57</sup> for what that bay was is problematical, and it certainly did not have "an almost continual roadstead."

The maneuver of the *Aimable* was not interrupted by La Salle "to remedy it," but after they saw Indians coming to the shore, they palavered and finally dismissed them, "for nothing was done while they were there." <sup>58</sup> Instead of going to the *Aimable*, La Salle went to the village and on his return saw the damage done to the ship. The next episode is the wounding of Morenger; "but after all it was their fault, and it was against what had been recommended to them:—mistrust and vigilance." <sup>59</sup>

"One day Father Zénobe having gone out in a boat, it was dashed to pieces against the vessel by a sudden gust of wind." All got quickly on board, and Membré would have drowned but for a sailor who threw him a rope. "This is what made the author of whom I have spoken [Le Clercq] say that through his zeal, the said Father nearly drowned when the launch was dashed to pieces. He is mistaken in this, for the launch was not broken; it was found six months later in a cove of the said bay." <sup>60</sup>

"On the 21st [of April], Easter Eve, Sieur de la Salle came to the camp at the sea, where the next day and the three following that great festival was celebrated with all possible solemnity, each

<sup>55</sup> Tronson to Belmont, April 15, 1685, Margry, 2: 355; Journal of Minet, *ibid.*, 3: 592; Minet's map in BSH, C 4044-4; Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, ASH, 115-9: no. 12.

<sup>56</sup> *El Rio del Espiritu Santo*, New York, 1945, 1 ff.

<sup>57</sup> Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, ASH, 115-9: no. 12.

<sup>58</sup> Margry, 3: 150.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 156.

one receiving his Creator." La Salle returned to the fort shortly after his departure; having heard gunfire, he came back to investigate. If he had returned for Easter, Joutel, whose friend Le Gros was bitten by a rattle-snake on Easter Sunday, would certainly have mentioned the presence of La Salle. Instead the explorer returned to the camp in July.<sup>61</sup>

"The fort, which was built in a very advantageous position, was soon in a state of defense, furnished with twelve pieces of cannon and a magazine under ground for fear of fire . . . At the house they raised all kinds of domestic animals, cows, hogs, and poultry, which multiplied greatly." All of which is purely imaginary, says Joutel, they had a few pigs, one cock and one hen, "which have since produced a few more." With regard to the goats, the female being sterile, both were killed during the illness of Jean Cavelier; as for the fort, it consists "of a house with eight pieces of cannon; unfortunately, there were no cannon balls."<sup>62</sup> Joutel added in the Delisle résumé:

With regard to domestic animals of all kinds spoken of by the author of the [*First*] *Establishment of the Faith in New France*, which treats of the voyages of M. de la Salle, he writes that he extracted it from the memoirs of Father Anastasius with whom I came back from the said country. I have not noticed that he wrote a single line during our return journey; he even expected me to hand over to him a copy of what I had written. Besides, I do not believe that he [Anastasius] wished to put down falsehoods, some of which are self-contradictory; it is not necessary to have gone to the said country to see it. All the animals about which he speaks consisted of pigs, one rooster, one hen and two goats. He did not speak the truth when he said that the fort was soon built and put in a state of defense, for there was only the house with eight pieces of cannon, two in each corner. As for the ten families, which he said were there, it is also false, for there was only one married man.<sup>63</sup>

The most tragic part of all took place in October, when "Sieur de la Salle seeing himself constantly insulted by the savages, and wishing, moreover, to have some of their canoes by force or consent, as he could not do without them, resolved to make open war on them in order to bring them to an advantageous peace." This was tragic because of the insecurity of those who had to remain at the fort. Instead of making friends with the Indians, La Salle, who had never forgiven the wounding of Morenger, had given

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 165, 167, 171.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>63</sup> Joutel in Delisle's résumé, ASH, 115-9: no. 11. This is partly printed in Margry, 3: 190, note.

orders to Joutel to fire upon them.<sup>64</sup> When, later on, he wished to correct his mistake, it was too late. All of which is quite different from what Le Clercq said: "The execution done among the Indians had rendered the little colony somewhat more secure."

Another tragedy was the murder of the pilot and his men. After this La Salle resolved to go and seek the mouth of the Mississippi by land. After his return, "toward the end of March,"<sup>65</sup> he described his adventures. La Salle "had always flattered himself that there must be an arm of the river emptying into [Mata-gorda] bay; but in this he was mistaken."<sup>66</sup> The clear result of his journey is put down by Joutel: "He had not found his river."<sup>67</sup> But Le Clercq, who in this particular follows the lead of the so-called journal of Cavelier,<sup>68</sup> blandly wrote: "At last, on February 13, 1686, Sieur de la Salle thought that he had found the river; he fortified himself there, left a part of his men, and with nine others continued his expedition." What is left unexplained is why La Salle should continue to look for the Mississippi after he had supposedly found it.

We now come to chapter 25, which contains the account of Father Anastasius Douay. The latter left Saumur for Paris on October 20, 1688,<sup>69</sup> taking with him Boissrondet and an Indian and arriving there some six weeks ahead of Cavelier. As he was no longer under secrecy, Father Douay talked of what had happened during the journey. He was, however, coming to Paris empty handed, for as Joutel said he had not written a single line. Armed with this oral information and later with the "relation made by N. on the memoirs of M. Cavelier, brother of M. de la Salle, who accompanied him on this voyage,"<sup>70</sup> it was not difficult to fill in a few pages of common places, embroidering and expanding as the author of the *First Establishment* went along. Unfortunately for him, the journal of Joutel was extant, and throughout he objected to the fanciful narrative as found in Le Clercq.

Let it not be said that it is the word of Joutel against that of Father Anastasius. For, as the former maintains, many of the

<sup>64</sup> "Et nous navons eu aucune relation avec eux ayant toujours tiré sur eux lorsqu'ils ont approché dudit poste aincy que m<sup>r</sup> de la salle men avoit donné ordre." Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, ASH, 115-9: no. 12.

<sup>65</sup> Margry, 3: 218.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 220.

<sup>68</sup> *The Journal of Jean Cavelier*, Chicago, 1938, 64.

<sup>69</sup> Margry, 3: 523.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. "The Authorship of the Journal of Jean Cavelier," *MID-AMERICA*, 25 (1943): 220 f.

statements are self contradictory, and moreover, for what pertains to the death of La Salle, it is not Joutel, but Father Douay who reported what actually happened. It is ridiculous to claim that because the latter twice refers to his "capuce [cowl]" during the first voyage to the Ceniz, Douay wrote the whole account.<sup>71</sup> As though the writer who invented so many fanciful details would stop at such trivia. On the other hand, Father Douay may well have remembered the two incidents, for as we have said above, he had some recollections of the journey.

"Although the details of his [Douay] remarks was lost in his many wrecks, the following is an abridgment of what he could gather from them, with which, perhaps, the reader will be better pleased than if I gave it in my own style." There is absolutely no difference between the style of the preceding chapter and the style of what Father Anastasius says here, any more than there is between the supposed narrative of Membré and the style of the rest of the narrative of La Salle's adventures.

We should remark here that although Joutel did not take part in the first expedition to the Ceniz, he followed exactly the same route in the last voyage of La Salle; this explains why the names of tribes and rivers are the same in both. Except for the illness of La Salle and Morenger, which is only found in the "journal" of Cavalier,<sup>72</sup> most of what is said about the first voyage to the Ceniz is simply fine writing.

"On the third day we perceived in some of the finest plains in the world a number of people, some on foot, others on horseback, booted and spurred, and seated on saddles." They engaged in a lengthy conversation, and Joutel remarked "as though we had the gift of tongues." With regard to the cibola, La Salle's lieutenant commented "he must have read this description in a treatise of geography." Elsewhere Anastasius is made to say: "Sieur Cavalier and I endeavored here, as we had done elsewhere, to give some first knowledge of the true God." Said Joutel, "as though our Recollect Father had no trouble in making himself understood." The same must be said of La Salle's speech to the Indians. He told them "that the chief of the French was the greatest chief in the world, as high as the sun, and as far above the Spaniard as the sun is above the earth. On his recounting the victories of our monarch they burst into exclamations, putting their hand on their mouth as a mark of

<sup>71</sup> A. Godbout, *Centenaire de l'Histoire du Canada de François-Xavier Garneau*, 286.

<sup>72</sup> *The Journal of Jean Cavalier*, 72.



astonishment." As for the Spaniards, who played such a great part in this relation, they were at least 200 leagues away.<sup>73</sup>

After four men had deserted, "Sieur de la Salle and his nephew, Sieur de Morenger, were attacked with a violent fever, which brought them to extremity. Their illness was long, and obliged us to make a very long stay at this place; for when the fever, after frequent attacks, left them at last it required time to restore them." This, as we have said, is found in Cavelier's journal; but while Joutel denies that La Salle was ill, he says that "it is quite true that Sieur de Morenger found himself incommodated, but this did not last long."<sup>74</sup>

Le Clercq tells us that La Salle returned to the camp on October 17, 1686, whereas he was back in August of that year. The word "Aout" is in the margin of Joutel's autograph which Delisle copied, and August is the only possible date if the text of Joutel—as in Margry—is to make sense. La Salle intended to leave for his second journey to the Ceniz as soon as his men were rested, "but the heat being bothersome, the said sieur [La Salle] thought it better to let it pass, after which time one could leave and go straight back to the village [Ceniz] where horses and grain were found."<sup>75</sup> La Salle was making ready to leave, when a hernia delayed him for nearly three months.<sup>76</sup> Hence, he did not remain "two and a half months at St. Louis Bay," but five full months.

We left on January 12, 1687; M. de la Salle took me along, and left Sieur Barbier as governor of the fort. With the latter were Sieur de Chefdeville, two Recollects, Fathers Zénobe and Maxime, the marquis de la Sablonnière, a surgeon, and others numbering twenty in all, including seven girls and women. Barbier was the only one who was married, although the author about whom I have spoken [Le Clercq] says that there were ten families. All of which is false, as what he wrote about those Indian families which are said to be sociable.

He also mentioned a quantity of nations whom he named and whom he said he saw in the voyage which he made with M. de la Salle. These names are invented, for I have never heard anyone speak about them. It is the same as when he said that on his return he visited the bay and all the rivers which fell into it.

He said that he saw a number of Indians booted and spurred. All they have is a poor skin on the back of their horses, and we saw only a few saddle bows among the Ceniz. This is then false, as well as the number of nations which he said he saw; for M. de la Salle makes mention of only four kinds of villages in his voyage, and among these only the Ceniz must

<sup>73</sup> Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, ASH, 115-9: no. 12, *passim*.

<sup>74</sup> Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, *ibid*.

<sup>75</sup> Margry, 3: 250.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 254.

be said to be a village, all the others are wanderers who hunt and fish, and do not sow Indian corn. Elsewhere, he says that M. de la Salle taught these nations; he must have had the gift of tongues.<sup>77</sup>

They were seventeen in number on the last voyage of La Salle, and not twenty as said in Le Clercq. "The very first day we met an army of Bahamas going to war with the Erigoanna; Sieur de la Salle made an alliance with them." The "army" numbered fifteen, and as they came while La Salle was away, they were told to come back; they did so on the morrow, to the number of twenty.<sup>78</sup> The Bahamas were not met on the first day, but on the twenty-first of the month.<sup>79</sup> In his "journal" Cavelier says that they visited a village of Bracamo on the sixth of January.<sup>80</sup> "He wished also to treat with the Quinets, who fled at our approach; but having overtaken them by means of our horses, we treated them so kindly that they promised an inviolable peace." The tribe to which these Indians belonged is not given in Joutel. La Salle, who now knew better, was concerned with the safety of his fort on the Gulf; but these precautions, remarked Joutel, "should have been taken from the very beginning when we came to this country."<sup>81</sup>

"On the fourth day, three leagues further to the northeast, we came to the first rivière aux Cannes." This was the second, not the fourth day of the march.<sup>82</sup> We might just as well forget about the visit to the villages of the Quaras and the Anachorema; they met Indians on the way, but no names were given. "Five leagues farther we passed the Sablonnière, because it is surrounded by sandy soil, though all the rest is good land and vast prairies." The reason why this river was so called is because of an accident that happened to Sieur de la Sablonnière when La Salle went on an expedition toward the bay.<sup>83</sup> The Robec, the Maligne, and the Hiens were crossed, which is not surprising, for La Salle followed exactly the same route on his last voyage as he had done on the first one to the Cenis. As for the Tahara, the Tyakappan, these tribes do not exist.

We now come to the death of Morenger, Saget, Nika, and La Salle. First of all, let us notice that the whole voyage before the tragedy—more than two months—takes exactly six small pages, the

<sup>77</sup> Joutel in Delisle, *ASH*, 115-9: no. 11.

<sup>78</sup> Margry, 3: 266.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 276.

<sup>80</sup> *The Journal of Jean Cavelier*, 76.

<sup>81</sup> Margry, 3: 265.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 261.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 279.

same number of pages as it took to narrate the murders. After a fitting introduction, we are told that "Sieur de Morenger lingered for the space of two hours, during which he gave every mark of a death precious in the sight of God, pardoning his murderers, embracing them even, and making all the acts of sorrow and contrition, as they themselves assured us after they recovered from their great blindness."

We shall now give the account of Larchevesque to Joutel. As will be seen, there is a vast difference between the two narratives, and there is no reason to suspect Larchevesque, who was in the plot.

Liotot having taken a hatchet began with Morenger, to whom he gave several blows on the head—a few of them are enough to kill a man—he then went to Saget and to the poor Shawnee; so that in a short while he massacred the three of them without any of them having time to say a single word. Morenger sat up, for he was not dead yet, but was unable to say a single word. And they forced Sieur de Marle to finish Morenger off, although he was not in the plot. While the wretched surgeon [Liotot] executed his evil design, the others had their arms ready, just in case one of them tried to defend himself. So that he killed the three of them without their having time to say a single word. It is not therefore, as the author about whom I have spoken [Le Clercq] says, that Sieur de Morenger had remained alive for a time after he had been wounded, having pardoned to those who had treated him thus, as well as many other things. All of this is false.<sup>84</sup>

After the murder of Morenger, Saget and Nika, the assassins had to dispose of La Salle. On the way to the spot, Anastasius is made to say that the explorer "conversed with me only of matters of piety, grace and predestination." He was overcome with melancholy and his state of mind was far from being normal. "I roused him from his lethargy, nevertheless, and at the end of two leagues we found the bloody cravat of his lackey [Saget]." Having asked where his nephew was, they "answered with broken words, showing us where we would find the said sieur." Two men were in the grass; one of them fired and missed, whereas the second "lodged his ball in the head of M. de la Salle, who expired an hour after, on March 19, 1687." Anastasius exhorted him to die well, and La Salle grasping his hand, "at every word I suggested to him and especially at that of pardoning his enemies . . . I did not wish to leave the spot, after he had expired, without having laid him out and buried him as well as I could, and I raised a cross over his grave."

<sup>84</sup> Joutel's autograph in Delisle, *ASH*, 115-9: no. 13. Compare the version of Margry, 3: 328.

This then is what Anastasius is supposed to have done. Now let us see what he actually did. "The narrative of the Recollect [Anastasius] in *Le Clercq* remains then the unique account of the only eye-witness of the death of La Salle."<sup>85</sup> Rather, "the narrative of the Recollect in *Joutel* remains the unique account of the death of La Salle." For the narrative in *Joutel* and not the fiction in *Le Clercq* is the only authority in the matter; although he himself was not present, Anastasius told *Joutel* exactly what took place as soon as he could.

According to *Joutel*, both Douay and La Salle left for the place where the latter thought his nephew was, and seeing some eagles wheeling in the sky, La Salle judged that the men he sought could not be far off. He then fired his gun and neglected to reload. The assassins knew that he was coming, and two of them hid in the grass. La Salle asked Larchevesque where his nephew was, and was told that he was farther down the river.

At the same time a shot rang out, fired by the said Duhaut, who was very near him, hidden in the grass. The shot struck the said sieur in the head, and he fell dead on the spot without saying a word, to the great astonishment of Father Anastasius who was nearby and thought that he was going to be shot too. He did not know what to do, that is, to advance or to flee, as he had told me since."

Duhaut, however, cried out that they did not wish him any harm, that he wanted to take revenge on Morenger, and other things to that effect. The assassins stripped La Salle, tearing off even his shirt; Liotot was particularly offensive. After they had thus stripped him, they dragged his body to the bushes, where they left him to the wolves and other beasts. *Joutel* then goes on to say:

All of this is far from the charity which the said author [*Le Clercq*] says that Anastasius had toward him. According to this author, the latter buried La Salle and even planted a cross on his grave. All of which is false. He also said that he had found the cravat of the valet of the said sieur. But if that had been the case, the said sieur would have taken precautions, and would not have exposed himself the way he did. As for what *Le Clercq* alleged that Anastasius did not abandon the said sieur until he breathed his last, giving all the marks of a good Christian:—from the very mouth and from the very confession of Father Anastasius, La Salle did not say a single word.<sup>86</sup>

"We often heard [the assassins] say to one another that they must get rid of us." As a matter of fact, even before the return

<sup>85</sup> *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, 43 (1937): 147.

<sup>86</sup> *Joutel's* autograph in Delisle, ASH, 115-9: no. 13. Cf. the version in Margry, 3: 330f, where all the comments are left out.

to the camp they "changed their mind and agreed not to murder anybody unless they should be provoked."<sup>87</sup> They wished, however, to pick up a quarrel with Joutel, but the latter was too wise to give them an opportunity.<sup>88</sup> Although Joutel and the younger Cavelier had occasion to put them to death, they were dissuaded from their designs by Jean Cavelier, "saying that they must leave revenge to God."<sup>89</sup>

The shooting of Liotot and Duhaut took place on May 8, Ascension Day. They were not together on the eve of the feast, as Anastasius tells us, for Hiens arrived on the 8th, accompanied by Grolet and Ruter; and there was no question of exhorting them, "at which they seemed affected and resolved to confess; but this did not last." The man whose shirt was burnt was Duhaut, the murderer of La Salle; Liotot was executed after having gone to confession. As for Larchevesque, "the third author of the plot," he was hunting at the time, and Joutel warned him not to say anything.<sup>90</sup>

The Indians and the few surviving Frenchmen having left on a war party, morning and night prayers were said in common by Anastasius, Cavelier and their companions.

We tried to make the Indians comprehend the greatness of Him who gave us life, who made wheat and other plants grow; but as we did not know their language, it was very difficult to make them understand. That is the reason why I am surprised to read that the author about whom I have spoken several times [Le Clercq] dare say that Anastasius preached and taught them catechism. This cannot be done unless one has spent several years among these Indians and one has learned their language.<sup>91</sup>

While the travelers were waiting for Grolet, they "took occasion to tell them that we came on behalf of God to instruct them in the truth and save their souls." This is also contradicted by Joutel:

I am surprised that the author about whom I have previously spoken [Le Clercq] can say that Father Anastasius exhorted them and explained the mysteries of our religion to them. This can only be done by knowing their language perfectly, and I did not notice that the said Father ever took the trouble of writing a single word.<sup>92</sup>

With regard to the death of De Marle, he did not know how to swim and was not swallowed up in an "abyss"; the Indians took him out of the water immediately, and not a few hours later. "The

<sup>87</sup> Margry, 3: 323.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 324.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 332.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 368-371.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 375.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 396, note.



Indian admired our ceremonies [burial of De Marle], from which we took occasion to give them several instructions during the week we remain in that place." They were now among the Caddo, and neither Joutel nor anybody else had any idea of what their language was. He simply said: "We tried to make them understand that we prayed to God for the dead, showing the heavens."<sup>93</sup>

What follows is the story of the trek to the Arkansas; their arrival there, their departure and the beginning of the ascent of the Mississippi are briefly narrated. En route, they "visited" the Chickasaw, twenty-five leagues from the Arkansas. We are told that they numbered at least four thousand warriors, and that the chiefs "offered to come and dwell on the Wabash to be nearer to us." This is in the "journal" of Cavelier.<sup>94</sup> They did not visit the Chickasaw,<sup>95</sup> but when Tonti found a band of these Indians on his way to the sea, he invited them to live in peace. "The man called Couture had mentioned this to us before our departure. The said Indian [guides] gave us to understand that the journey from the Mississippi to their villages was only two days."<sup>96</sup> The names of the tribes on the Missouri are simply guess work as well as the number of villages of each tribe. It would have been much better to report what the guide had said, namely, that on the Missouri and on its branches, there were many villages.

About midway between the river Wabash and that of the Missouri is found Cape St. Anthony. It was to this place only, and not further that Sieur Jolliet descended in 1673; they were taken with their whole party, by the Monsoupelea. These Indians having told them that they would be killed if they went further, they turned back not having descended lower than thirty or forty leagues below the mouth of the Illinois River.

This is very interesting indeed. How does our author explain the fact that Jolliet only saw the Monsoupelea on his return from the Arkansas?<sup>97</sup> How does he explain that Anastasius never saw, never heard of this tribe about which he supposedly talks so glibly? And finally, how did these Indians speak to Jolliet, considering that Marquette did not understand one word of what they were telling the Frenchmen?<sup>98</sup>

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 407.

<sup>94</sup> *The Journal of Jean Cavelier*, 124.

<sup>95</sup> "Depuis les acancea Jusques aux Illinois nous nen trouvâmes pas seulement une." *Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, ASH*, 115-9: no. 1.

<sup>96</sup> Margry, 3: 469.

<sup>97</sup> "Marquette's Autograph Map of the Mississippi River," *MID-AMERICA*, 27 (1945): 51.

<sup>98</sup> C. W. Alword, "An Unrecognized Father Marquette Letter," *The American Historical Review*, 25 (1920): 679.

I had brought with me the printed book of this pretended discovery, and I remarked all along my route that there was not a word of truth in it. It is said that he went as far as the Arkansas, and that he was obliged to return for fear of being taken by the Spaniards; and yet the Arkansas assured us that they had not seen other Europeans before M. de la Salle.

The sweeping statement that there is not a word of truth in Thévenot's version of the voyage of 1673 is rather out of place coming from an author whose book teems with so many fabrications. We might ask how Father Anastasius, in the midst of the difficulties and hardships of the last seven months, had saved the "printed book"? How did he know that the Quapaw had not seen any Europeans before M. de la Salle? He may have inquired from Couture, but Joutel makes no mention of such an inquiry; to say nothing of the travelers having other worries besides questioning the Quapaw about a journey which had taken place fourteen years earlier. Moreover, when in 1700, Gravier descended the Mississippi, the Quapaw chief told the missionary that "he had danced the calumet" to Marquette in 1673.<sup>99</sup>

It is said that they saw painted monsters that the boldest men would have difficulty to look at, and that there was something supernatural about them. This frightful monster is a horse painted on a rock with matachia and some other wild beasts made by the Indians. It is said that they cannot be reached, yet I touched them without any difficulty.

Thévenot does not say that the "boldest men would have difficulty in looking at" the monsters, but that the "boldest Indian dare not look upon them."<sup>100</sup> It was the Indians who saw "something supernatural" about the petroglyphs, for Joutel tells us that the guides "offered tobacco, called him brother or comrade, and said that they would die if they did not do that."<sup>101</sup>

"The truth is that the Miami, pursued by the Metchigamea, having been drowned in the river, the Indians ever since that time present tobacco to these grotesque figures whenever they pass, in order to appease the manitou." The Indians were impressed then, which confirmed what Joutel had written. This, however, was not the only time when they made sacrifices and peace offerings, for they had done this at the mouth of the Ohio<sup>102</sup> and repeated the performance at the mouth of the Missouri. As for the tale

<sup>99</sup> JR, 65: 120.

<sup>100</sup> *Voyages de Mr Thevenot*, 29.

<sup>101</sup> Margry, 3: 471.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 470.

about Miami and Metchigamea, our author is very careful not to say when this pursuit is supposed to have taken place.

I would be loath to believe that *Sieur Jolliet* vouched for the printed account of that discovery, which is not, in fact, under his name, and which was not published till after the discovery made by *Sieur de la Salle*. It would be easy to show that it was printed on false memoirs, which the author, who had never been on the spot, might have followed in good faith.

We shall refresh the memory of the narrator: *Thévenot's* book was published in 1681, *La Salle* did not go down to the Gulf until 1682, and his voyage was not known in France until 1683. It is quite true that the author of the account in *Thévenot* had never been on the spot, but *Le Clercq* did not know this;<sup>103</sup> and with regard to false memoirs the evidence that *Jolliet* made the voyage of 1673, that he descended the Mississippi down to the Arkansas, is of an incomparably higher order than the evidence for the so-called *Anastasius* account.

The next few pages are concerned with the arrival at Fort St. Louis, with the false start for Lake Michigan, and with the return of *Tonti*. The latter told them that in his second voyage down the Mississippi, there was at the mouth of the river "a very fine port with a beautiful entrance and wide channel; and also places fit for building forts, and not at all inundated, as he had supposed when he descended the first time with *Sieur de la Salle*, adding that the lower river is habitable, and even inhabited by Indian villages." It is enough to mention these facts to realize that all this is invented, and that the inundation of the Mississippi made it impossible for nearly forty years to build any fort whatsoever on the lower course of the river.<sup>104</sup> *Tonti* also understood that *La Salle* figured out that there could be no more than "forty or fifty leagues" from Bay St. Louis to the Mississippi in a straight line. In a straight line the distance is 400 miles. If they were so close to the Mississippi, why should *La Salle* wish to go to the Illinois country?

We are then given a description of the country. The forests are full of every kind of trees, "so distributed that you can every-

<sup>103</sup> "The 'Récit des voyages et des decouvertes du Pere Jacques Marquette,' " *MID-AMERICA*, 28 (1946): 183 ff.

<sup>104</sup> "Mr. de la salle nous a toujours dit quil falloit remonter le flueve pres de soixante lieues pour trouver un terrain proper a habiter attendu que le bas dudit flueve etoit inhabitable a cause des debordements Et des vases quil laissoit Et que il paroissoit mesme noyé aincy quil nous a toujours dit Et mesme en france." *Remarques tirees du livre intitulé, ASH*, 115-9: no. 12.

where ride through on horseback." Joutel, however, speaks of deep ravines, of impassable rivers and of all kinds of accidents. There follows a fish story. At the foot of the fort, one does not bother with basket or net, one just puts one's hand into the river, and takes out all the fish one wants. "Our people one day took away from an Indian a fish-head which was alone a load for a man." Horses are plentiful too, "the Indians thinking themselves well paid when they get an axe for a good horse." Of course, we are not told that this side of the Arkansas there are no horses. Sugar cane will come well, for Louisiana is close to "Terra Firma." The fact that sugar cane only began to be planted in the fifties of the eighteenth century is a detail which is omitted by the narrator. The various accidents along the journey prevented them from searching for the treasures of the country, but there is lead and copper ready to work.

Father Anastasius had intended to found a mission among the Cenis, where Father Membré was to join him. Perhaps, he says, this Father as well as Father Maxime have already gone there, and M. de Chefdeville is at the mission of Fort St. Louis. Although they did not know it, the two Recollects and M. de Chefdeville had been massacred by the Indians two years before this was written.

"There were nine or ten French families with their children, and, besides several of our people had gone to get and had actually married Indian women to multiply the colony. What had befallen them since I do not know." When Anastasius left, there were in all seven women and girls; one of whom had married Barbier; as for those marrying Indian women, the French were at war with the Indians from the very beginning.

"This," he says, "is a faithful extract of what Father Anastasius could remember of his toilsome voyage." They finally reached Paris, "God enabling them to be still together," when they "presented an account of all to the marquis de Seignelay." First of all, it is not true that they were still together. On October 20, Father Douay went straight to Paris from Saumur, whereas Joutel went to Rouen with Cavelier. The latter did not leave this place for Paris until December 10. Second, what was said to Seignelay? Did Douay continue the pretense and hide the death of La Salle? Apparently not, for even if the Recollect had said nothing, Cavelier was soon to set matters right with the minister. Why in the account purportedly written by Father Anastasius is there not a word about concealing La Salle's death? This would certainly have been more relevant than the trivialities indulged in by the author of the *First*

*Establishment*; for Joutel in his journal, comes back again and again to the assassination of the explorer.

If there was nothing else in the pseudo-Douay narrative than the account of the murder of La Salle, it would be sufficient to arouse our suspicions as to its genuineness. For when an eye-witness gives two such different versions of the same event one may justifiably wonder whether there is not in it many more tamperings with the facts.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Loyola University, Chicago



## Book Reviews

*The Journals and Indian Paintings of George Winter 1837-1839.* Published by Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1948. Pp. xix, 207, 31 illustrations.

This large volume bound beautifully in buckram is indeed an example of elegant and artistic printing. Its format undoubtedly will long be pointed to with pride by The Lakeside Press. The gratitude of the Indiana Historical Society toward the Lilly Endowment which supplied the funds for the publication and toward Cable G. Ball and the Tippecanoe County Historical Association for their permissions and co-operation will remain permanently expressed in this library treasure. Few will quibble at the price of the volume, twelve and one-half dollars, in view of the many values it expresses.

The Introduction is by Howard H. Peckham, Secretary of the Indiana Historical Society. He traces briefly the story of artists who from the time of the Roanoke colony to George Winter portrayed the North American Indians in oils, in water colors, in ink, or in pencil. Because few artists depicted the Central Western Indians and because Winter made firsthand historical records of the Miami and Potawatomi, more than seventy water colors and numerous pen and pencil sketches, Peckham assigns a rightful historical importance to Winter. Moreover, Winter left letters, notes, and diaries of his days among the Indians.

Wilbur D. Peat, director of the John Herron Art Museum, has ten pages of appraisal of George Winter as an artist. Mr. Peat confirms the historical evaluation of the water colors by saying that "they were made from the standpoint of ethnological accuracy rather than delightful artistry," and inscribed "with the names of people, places, and dates." (P. 6.)

Miss Gayle Thornbrough writes the "Biographical Sketch" of George Winter and edits his "Journal of a Visit to Lake Kee-wau-nay and Crooked Creek, 1837," and his "Journal of a Visit to Deaf Man's Village, 1839." The first thirty pages of the biography are Winter's Autobiography, 1809-1830, as he wrote it in 1873. This covers the period from the birth of Winter in 1809 at Portsea, Southampton, England, to his arrival in New York. Little is known of his life of study and hardship in the East and in Cincinnati. His stay in Logansport, Indiana, 1837-1850, is told charmingly by Miss Thornbrough, chiefly from his reminiscences, letters, and art work. The story is one of privation for the artist and his family, until he settled in Lafayette. There from 1850 to 1876 when he was suddenly stricken, he passed his years working before his easel and distributing his work for generally meagre returns.

The two journals and the portraits of historic white and Indian personages with their descriptive notes are good source materials. Winter expresses with every brush-stroke and with poetic and journalistic pen his love for the land of his adoption and his sympathy for the Red Man, "the unfortunate aboriginies . . . , whose fate undoubtedly is a rapid exit from this nether world." His accounts of the drinking habits of the Indians,

and, in fact, of his own partakings of the "critter," reveal him as not puritanical. The second of the journals, written in 1871 about an event of 1839, is more particular and less garrulous. In this Visit to the Deaf Man's Village Winter tells how he came to paint the portrait of Frances Slocum, the "Lost Sister," who after a captivity of nearly sixty years among the Indians, had been discovered on the banks of the Wabash.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

\* \* \* \*

*Old St. Patrick's Cathedral.* By Mother Mary Peter Carthy, O.S.U. Monograph Series XXIII, United States Catholic Historical Society. New York, 1947. Pp.

The history of New York's first cathedral, now a humble parish-church in lower Manhattan, makes interesting reading. The building was begun in 1809 by Father Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., vicar-general for the first two prelates, Bishop Concanen, O.P., and Bishop Connolly, O.P.; its dedication to St. Patrick, suggested by Archbishop John Carroll, made it the first church in the United States to be placed under the invocation of Ireland's patron saint. From 1809 to 1879 as the mother church of the vast New York diocese it was to be presided over by four bishops, Connolly, Dubois, Hughes and McCloskey. Much of its early history concerns the financial problems of raising funds from poor people amidst hard times; the work contains some interesting accounts of the methods of gathering monies—pew-rents, fund-societies and collections. This financial task was greatly complicated by the obstructions of recalcitrant trustees, a problem which the determined Archbishop Hughes finally and completely solved. In its early days old St. Patrick's was more than once threatened with destruction by Nativists and Know-Nothings; but the bigots' fanaticism drew back before the courage of the men-parishioners who gathered about their cathedral resolved to defend it with their lives. Many of the first steps in Catholic education in New York were taken by the Cathedral parish: the New York Literary Institution, the establishments of the Ursulines, the Sisters of Charity, the Religious of the Sacred Heart, the Sisters of Mercy and the Christian Brothers. The original edifice was enlarged in 1838 to become the largest church structure in the city. An accidental fire in 1866 completely destroyed the old building, which however was rebuilt within six months. Several diocesan and provincial synods were held within the walls of old St. Patrick's; ten bishops were consecrated at its altar; and the first American Cardinal, Cardinal McCloskey, was invested with the dignity of a prince of the church in its sanctuary. With the opening of the great cathedral on Fifth Avenue, the older building became a simple parish church. Mother Carthy has made her scholarly history pleasant reading by the introduction of several interesting incidents; she has also enlivened the text with four prints of the old cathedral. One would like to see added a present-day photograph of the venerable structure, and also a lengthier account of the parish since 1879.

MARTIN P. HARNEY

Boston College.